

10317. By Mr. EVANS of California: Petition of members of the First Russian Baptist Church of San Francisco, for the relief of Russian nationals unable to return to their nation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

10318. Also, petition of approximately 185 persons who are opposed to the return of the liquor traffic in any form in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10319. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of Substitute Post Office Employees' Association, New York City, urging enactment of House Joint Resolution 576, to limit the reductions in compensation applicable to certain employees whose compensation for any month is less than the monthly rate of compensation to which the economy act applies; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

10320. Also, petition of E. N. Puckett, manager Union Equity Cooperative Exchange, Enid, Okla., discussing the domestic allotment agricultural bill (H. R. 13991) and making certain suggestions in regard thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10321. Also, petition of the Asheboro Hosiery Mills, Asheboro, N. C., submitting plan for economic relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10322. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of 21 residents of Alexandria, Minn., urging enforcement of the eighteenth amendment and protesting against any change in the prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10323. Also, petition of Minnesota Cooperative Wool Growers' Association urging retention of Farm Board; to Committee on Agriculture.

10324. Also, petition of Post No. 1173, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Moose Lake, Minn., urging payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10325. Also, petition of Parent-Teacher Association, Benson, Minn., urging regulation of motion-picture industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10326. Also, petition of Local No. 1, Bricklayers, Masons, and Master Mechanics Benevolent Union, St. Paul, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 5125; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10327. Also, petition of Cooperative Creamery, Sleepy Eye, Minn., urging enactment of Frazier bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10328. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Browns Valley, Minn., urging enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10329. Also, petition of State legislature, State of Minnesota, urging remedial legislation to protect domestic producers against unfair competition, due to depreciated foreign currencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10330. Also, petition of fourth and fifth districts, American Legion of Minnesota, urging adequate provision for the maintenance and equipment of our National Reserve Marine Aviation Corps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10331. Also, petition of Minnesota Implement Dealers' Association, Owatonna, Minn., indorsing the Quamme plan of refinancing farm mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10332. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Missionary Society of Wilson Avenue Church of Christ, of the city of Columbus, Ohio, petitioning Congress to establish a Federal motion-picture commission and to act favorably on Senate bill 1079 and Senate Resolution 170 before the Interstate Commerce Committee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10333. By Mr. LEAVITT: Petition of Rev. Lester H. Norton and others against the weakening or changing of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10334. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of R. H. Comey Brooklyn Co., dyers and bleachers, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning certain tariff legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10335. By Mr. ROBINSON: Resolution of the Toledo Commercial Club, Toledo, Iowa, signed by W. P. Crossman, pres-

ident, and Will A. Pye, secretary, urging that great economy be exercised in administering the Federal Government, that unessential commissions, bureaus, and departments be abandoned, and that there may be systematization of all Government activities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

10336. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of R. H. Comey Brooklyn Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., with reference to the present tariff rates on hat braids coming from Japan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10337. Also, petition of Substitute Post Office Employees Association, New York City, favoring the Fitzpatrick House Joint Resolution 576; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

10338. By Mr. SWING: Petition of the State of California, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 1197, known as the farmers' farm relief act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10339. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of Miss Gladys M. Jones and other residents of Ashfield, Mass., urging an embargo on shipments of arms to other countries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10340. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Council of the City of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging that the Postmaster General be authorized and directed to issue a special series of postage stamps commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the naturalization as an American citizen and appointment of Thaddeus Kosciuszko as brevet brigadier general of the Continental Army on October 13, 1783; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1933

(Legislative day of Friday, February 10, 1933)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 222. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of B. F. Hart; and

S. 1586. An act for the relief of the estate of Peter Paul Franzel, deceased.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 220. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Van Camp Sea Food Co. (Inc.); and

S. 3438. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of Lindley Nurseries (Inc.).

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 188. An act for the relief of Tampico Marine Iron Works; and

S. 2148. An act for the relief of Clarence R. Killion.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 811. An act for the relief of Martha Edwards, Norfolk Protestant Hospital, and Dr. Julian L. Rawls;

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of William L. Jenkins;

H. R. 999. An act for the relief of Lewis E. Green;

H. R. 1825. An act for the relief of William M. Stoddard;

H. R. 1938. An act for the relief of Katherine G. Taylor;

H. R. 2188. An act for the relief of Arthur K. Finney;

H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of William Sheldon;

H. R. 3036. An act for the relief of Florence Mahoney;

H. R. 3607. An act for the relief of Dr. M. M. Brayshaw;

H. R. 3694. An act for the relief of Ada B. (Gould) Gollan;
H. R. 3727. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Fox;
H. R. 3848. An act for the relief of Ed Symes and wife, Elizabeth Symes, and certain other citizens of the State of Texas;

H. R. 5801. An act for the relief of Clyde W. Edwards;
H. R. 5947. An act for the relief of John Moore;
H. R. 6381. An act for the relief of Escha Whittington Casey;

H. R. 6461. An act for the relief of Frank D. Whitfield;
H. R. 6618. An act for the relief of Lissie Maud Green;
H. R. 6774. An act to authorize amendment of the act of February 25, 1927, for the payment of damages caused by reason of the overflow of the Rio Grande on August 17, 1921;

H. R. 6785. An act for the relief of Jose Ramon Cordova;
H. R. 7040. An act for the relief of Sadie Bermi;
H. R. 7655. An act for the relief of Dr. Charles T. Granger;
H. R. 7761. An act for the relief of Mary Josephine Lobert;
H. R. 8619. An act for the relief of Nellie Oliver;
H. R. 9053. An act for the relief of Carl C. Baxter;
H. R. 9606. An act for the relief of the estate of Clarendon Davis;

H. R. 9915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, adjudicate, and enter judgment on the claim of William W. McElrath against the United States for compensation for the manufacture of an invention of William W. McElrath covered by reissue letters patent issued by the Patent Office of the United States on the 19th day of February, 1924;

H. R. 10104. An act for the relief of the heirs of Burton S. Adams, deceased;

H. R. 10124. An act for the relief of A. Zappone, disbursing clerk, United States Department of Agriculture;

H. R. 10170. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of Joseph T. Ryerson & Son (Inc.);

H. R. 10756. An act for the relief of Clive Sprouse and Robert F. Moore;

H. R. 10891. An act to provide for the reimbursement of Guillermo Medina, hydrographic surveyor, for the value of personal effects lost in the capsizing of a Navy whaleboat off Galera Island, Gulf of Panama;

H. R. 11035. An act for the relief of Price Huff;

H. R. 11242. An act to relinquish the title of the United States in and to lands in Rapides Parish, State of Louisiana;

H. R. 11461. An act for the relief of C. N. Hildreth, jr., and

H. R. 11477. An act for the relief of George Charles Walters.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 914. An act for the relief of Katherine R. Theberge;
S. 1858. An act for the relief of Harriette Olsen;
S. 2144. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant a patent to certain lands to Charles R. Thornton;
S. 2395. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain land to school district No. 15, Lincoln County, Mont.;
S. 3504. An act for the relief of Lyman L. Miller; and
S. 4166. An act for the relief of James M. Griffin, disbursing agent, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the approval of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Friday, February 10, 1933.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.
The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|----------|----------------|---------------|
| Ashurst | Cutting | Kendrick | Schuyler |
| Austin | Dale | Keyes | Sheppard |
| Bailey | Davis | King | Shipstead |
| Bankhead | Dill | La Follette | Shortridge |
| Barkley | Fess | Lewis | Smith |
| Bingham | Fletcher | Logan | Smoot |
| Black | Frazier | McKellar | Steiwer |
| Blaine | George | McNary | Stephens |
| Borah | Glass | Moses | Swanson |
| Bratton | Glenn | Neely | Thomas, Idaho |
| Brookhart | Gore | Norbeck | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bulkley | Grammer | Norris | Trammell |
| Bulow | Hale | Nye | Tydings |
| Byrnes | Harrison | Oddie | Vandenberg |
| Capper | Hastings | Pittman | Wagner |
| Caraway | Hatfield | Reed | Walsh, Mass. |
| Clark | Hayden | Reynolds | Walsh, Mont. |
| Connally | Hebert | Robinson, Ark. | Watson |
| Coolidge | Hull | Robinson, Ind. | White |
| Costigan | Johnson | Russell | |
| Couzens | Kean | Schall | |

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My colleague [Mr. WHEELER] is unavoidably absent from the Senate on account of illness.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. HOWELL] is absent on official business of the Senate.

Mr. FESS. The junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] is also absent on official business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CLAIM OF THE WHITE BROS. & CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of the White Bros. & Co. against the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of miscellaneous papers on the files of the Children's Bureau which are not needed in the conduct of business and are lacking in historical interest, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. METCALF and Mr. COPELAND members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolutions of the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, which were ordered to lie on the table:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in opposition to continuance of Federal gasoline tax

Whereas the Federal gasoline sales tax is the premium which the American people pay against the speedy return of prosperity; and

Whereas although the revenue which this tax has brought into the Federal Treasury totals millions of dollars, it is most unprofitable as a measure of economy and of sound business judgment because of the burden which it imposes upon the American motorists; and

Whereas gasoline is the only commodity in the Nation on which taxes are paid in excess of the value of the cost of the product; and

Whereas the Federal gasoline tax makes the tax total practically confiscatory, the same being levied at a rate of 130 per cent of the selling price of the product; and

Whereas from July 1, 1932, to December 31, 1932, the collections of the 1-cent Federal tax on gasoline totaled \$52,839,826.70; and

Whereas the Federal gasoline tax is inequitable, onerous, uneven, costly, and productive of evasion, being not merely double taxation but multiple taxation, unwittingly imposed by the Congress when they were seeking the general good; and

Whereas, based on 1932 collections, the total 1933 State and Federal gasoline taxes in Nebraska, assuming that the present tax of 4 cents per gallon upon the use and distribution of motor-vehicle fuel continues and that the 1-cent gasoline tax for the United States still remains in force and effect, will amount to the fabulous sum of \$9,893,105, which the citizens and residents of the State of Nebraska will be compelled to pay; and

Whereas a continuance of the 1-cent Federal tax, together with the present 4-cent State of Nebraska gasoline tax, will constitute a tax burden which is so confiscatory that, in history, is without parallel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska in forty-ninth regular session assembled:

1. That this house goes on record as unalterably opposed to the continuance of the 1-cent Federal gasoline tax law and urges that the Congress of the United States repeal the same without delay.

2. That the chief clerk of this house be forthwith directed to forward copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Congressman representing the State of Nebraska in the National Congress, to the end that our Congressmen and Senators from Nebraska will vigorously oppose the continuance of the Federal gasoline tax and thereby hasten trade recovery in petroleum and other industries.

HENRY BOCK.

LINCOLN, NEBR., February 7, 1933.

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the house of representatives of the forty-ninth session of the Legislature of Nebraska on February 6, 1933.

MAX ADAMS, Chief Clerk.

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve if passed, a bill to repeal the packers and stockyards act (act of Congress, August 15, 1921), in so far as it authorizes or permits Federal authorities to fix charges for stockyard services at public stockyards as defined in said packers and stockyards act

Whereas the growing and feeding of livestock is Nebraska's chief industry; and

Whereas the major part of our livestock is necessarily handled through public markets and must bear the charges for yardage, feeding, weighing, commissions, and other stockyard services at such markets; and

Whereas the charges for stockyard services are a direct burden on the farmers and livestock producers of this State; and

Whereas the charges at all public markets serving Nebraska farmers and producers of livestock, such as those at Omaha, Sioux City, Kansas City, St. Joseph, St. Louis, and Chicago, as well as those at other places, are unreasonable and extortionate. For example, at the Union Stock Yards at Omaha the charge for prairie hay is now \$22.50 per ton, the charge for oats is 65 cents per bushel, and the charge for corn is 75 cents per bushel, the charges at the other stockyards being also unreasonable and extortionate; and

Whereas the charges for stockyard services are under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States and it is impossible for the farmer or shipper to go to Washington to seek redress because of the distance and the expense involved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska in forty-ninth regular session assembled:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, a bill to repeal the packers and stockyards act (act of Congress, August 15, 1921), in so far as such act authorizes or permits the control and fixing by the Federal authorities of charges for stockyard services, although the livestock receiving such services at public markets may be part of the current of interstate commerce and although it may be, at the time of receiving such services, actually in interstate commerce.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Senators, and Representatives from Nebraska.

HENRY BOCK.

LINCOLN, NEBR., February 7, 1933.

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the house of representatives of the forty-ninth session of the Legislature of Nebraska on February 7, 1933.

MAX ADAMS, Chief Clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was ordered to lie on the table:

Joint resolution memorializing Federal authorities to confine all contracts to be let for work to be done on or in connection with the Hoover Dam and other Federal construction projects to American firms and corporations

Whereas the Hoover Dam is a great national project being built at the expense of the American taxpayers; and

Whereas economic conditions at the present time are such that any public money spent for construction projects should be utilized to give employment to the maximum number of American citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of Wisconsin hereby respectfully memorializes the Federal officials who have charge of the letting of contracts for any Federal construction project, including contracts for the pur-

chase of equipment and materials, to exclude from consideration any foreign corporation or other bidders, and to let such contracts only to American citizens and American firms and corporations, and to require that all material used in such projects shall be manufactured in the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

CORNELIUS YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.

JOHN J. SLOCUM,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

THOS. J. O'MALLEY,
President of the Senate.

R. A. COBBAN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the passage of legislation to guarantee to farmers a price for their products which will give them the minimum cost of production, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented to-day by Mr. LA FOLLETTE.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the passage of legislation to aid farmers and home owners to retain their farms and homes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented to-day by Mr. LA FOLLETTE.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, favoring the passage of legislation to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the naturalization as an American citizen in 1783 of Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a hero of the Revolutionary War, by the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in his honor, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(See resolution printed in full when presented to-day by Mr. HASTINGS.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, favoring the passage of the so-called Cutting bill, being the bill (S. 5121) to amend Title I of the emergency relief and construction act of 1932, approved July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. L. 709), by authorizing cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States and Territories in relieving distress among unemployed needy transients, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented to-day by Mr. BRATTON.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Southern Oregon Law Enforcement Officers' Association, in convention assembled at Roseburg, Oreg., indorsing the work of the United States Bureau of Investigation under the leadership of its director, Mr. John Edgar Hoover, and especially the cooperation rendered by the identification division of that bureau, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BYRNES presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing Congress to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act so as to permit the States and political subdivisions thereof to borrow money for the purpose of refunding loans to be retired by taxation, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 9th instant, p. 3798, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. HASTINGS presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

STATE OF DELAWARE,
ONE HUNDRED AND FOURTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY.
Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

We hereby certify that the inclosed is the same act as was passed by both houses of the one hundred and fourth general assembly.

W. A. SIMONTON,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
J. THOMAS ROBINSON,
Speaker of the House.

We hereby certify that the inclosed act is properly backed, stamped, and sealed and is the same act as above certified to.

KARLENE H. CARPENTER,
Bill Clerk of the Senate.
OWEN K. MOORE,
Bill Clerk of the House.

Certified with—

WILLIAM P. SHORT,
Secretary of the Senate.
EDWIN E. SHALLCROSS,
Clerk of the House.

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 13, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact House Joint Resolution 191 to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the naturalization as an American citizen in 1783 of Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, a hero of the Revolutionary War, by issuing special series of postage stamps in honor of Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko

Whereas on October 13, 1933, will occur the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the naturalization as an American citizen of Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, a hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the service rendered by him was of great value and assistance to the cause of American independence and of such high importance that on October 13, 1783, he was appointed brevet brigadier general of the Continental Army and was granted his naturalization as an American citizen; and

Whereas it is but fitting that proper recognition should be given to the memory of Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, whose illustrious service in the War for American Independence is well known to all who are familiar with our history: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Delaware (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the General Assembly of the State of Delaware hereby respectfully requests and urges His Excellency, Hon. Herbert Hoover, President of the United States, the Senators and Representative in Congress from the State of Delaware to respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will provide for the effective carrying out of the provisions of the said resolution, whereby the Postmaster General would be authorized and directed to issue a special series of postage stamps of the denomination of 3 cents, of such design and for such period as he may determine, commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the naturalization as an American citizen and appointment of Thaddeus Kosciusko as brevet brigadier general of the Continental Army on October 13, 1783.

That a copy of this resolution be sent to President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and the Representative in Congress from Delaware.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Joint resolution regarding legislation to secure the farmers their cost of production

Whereas the present position of agriculture is the worst it has been in the entire history of the country; farm prices are at the lowest in generations and are still tending downward; dairy products were in December, 1932, 23 points below December, 1931; at least one-fourth of all farmers are delinquent in the payment of interest or taxes; and most serious discontent is developing in rural districts, which threatens the safety of government and society itself; and

Whereas the crux of the entire problem lies in the price realized for dairy and other farm products, since manifestly the farmers can not meet interest and taxes and continue to support their families unless they are paid a price for their products which gives them their cost of production; and

Whereas no single State can cope with this problem alone, since competition in the sale of farm products is nation-wide and to some extent world-wide, while the Federal Government, through its control of interstate commerce, foreign affairs, and customs duties, can affect the entire country and at least materially influence world conditions: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of Wisconsin respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to guarantee to farmers a price for their products which will give them their minimum cost of production, and expresses its opinion that no other measures of farm relief will prove adequate. While it is no doubt necessary also to refinance the farmers at a low rate of interest, such a measure will not alone solve the problem, since it will still leave the farmers with a great burden of debt which they must ulti-

mately repay through the proceeds from the sale of their products. Still other measures may be helpful, but a solution of the farm problem can be attained only through securing farmers their minimum cost of production; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof. A copy of this resolution shall also be transmitted to the Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, President elect of the United States, to whom the farmers of this State and the entire country are hopefully looking for leadership in solving the farm problem.

THOS. J. O'MALLEY,
President of the Senate.
R. A. COBBAN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
CORNELIUS YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN J. SLOCUM,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE also presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Joint resolution relating to Federal aid for owners of mortgaged farms and homesteads

Whereas there is now pending in Congress a bill appropriating and setting apart a special fund with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the purpose of aiding farmers and home owners who are in financial distress and unable to repay the mortgages on such farms and homesteads: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin respectfully memorializes and urges the Congress of the United States to pass such bill, or some other bill, which will aid farmers and home owners to retain their farms and homes; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly attested, be sent to the Presiding Officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

CORNELIUS YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN J. SLOCUM,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
THOS. J. O'MALLEY,
President of the Senate.
R. A. COBBAN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I present certain resolutions and memorials of various cities in California, the cities of Pasadena, Oakland, and others, protesting against the enactment of any Federal tax legislation which imposes, or may be interpreted as imposing, a burden of taxation upon States, State agencies, or publicly owned utilities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials and resolutions will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(The resolutions and memorials presented by Mr. JOHNSON are from the board of directors of the city of Pasadena, and city councils of numerous cities, utility districts, and associations, all in the State of California.)

Mr. BULKLEY presented resolutions adopted by the City Council of Martins Ferry, Ohio, protesting against the imposition of any Federal tax which imposes, or may be interpreted as imposing, a burden upon the States, State agencies, and/or publicly owned utilities, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter addressed to me by Mr. C. R. Reid, chairman of the Taxation Committee Public Ownership League of America and secretary of the California Tax Committee, California Municipal Utility Association, accompanied by resolutions from numerous cities, utility districts, and associations in California, protesting against Federal taxation which imposes—or may be interpreted to impose—a burden upon States, State agencies, or publicly owned utilities.

I present these resolutions and memorials and request that they be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials and resolutions will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

COOPERATION BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WITH THE STATES FOR RELIEF PURPOSES

Mr. BRATTON. I send forward a joint memorial passed by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing Congress to pass the bill (S. 5121) to amend Title I of the emergency relief and construction act of 1932, approved July

21, 1932 (47 Stat. L. 709), by authorizing cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States and Territories in relieving distress among unemployed needy transients, introduced by my colleague [Mr. CUTTING]. I ask that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Manufactures, and it is as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial No. 2 (Introduced by Senator J. W. Tackett)

A joint memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting the passage of Senate bill 5121, introduced December 8, 1932, by Hon. BRONSON CUTTING, United States Senator of New Mexico

Whereas upon December 8, 1932, the Hon. BRONSON CUTTING, United States Senator of New Mexico, introduced S. 5121, being "A bill to amend Title I of the emergency relief and construction act of 1932, approved July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. L. 709), by authorizing cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States and Territories in relieving distress among needy transients"; and

Whereas New Mexico, by reason of its geographical location and climate, is daily in receipt of many hundreds of transients, and by reason of present conditions of unemployment and distress many of these transients become stranded and subjects of charity; and

Whereas the passage of said bill will aid greatly in meeting these problems, which are growing too great for local charity to properly handle: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to act at once so as to assure the speedy passage of said bill; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the Presiding Officers of the Congress of the United States and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

A. W. HOCHENHULL,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

F. E. McCULLOCH,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

ALVAN N. WHITE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

GENARO ARMILJO,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Approved by me this 1st day of February, 1933.

ARTHUR SELIGMAN,
Governor of New Mexico.

FEDERAL AID IN HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, I present a memorial passed by the Wyoming Legislature in the form of an appeal to Congress to enact legislation providing funds for Federal aid in highway construction, which I ask may be appropriately referred.

The joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

State of Wyoming, ss:

I, A. M. Clark, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and correct copy of enrolled joint memorial No. 2, senate, of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Wyoming, being original senate joint memorial No. 2, approved by the governor on February 7, 1933, at 8.40 a. m.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 8th day of February, A. D. 1933.

A. M. CLARK, *Secretary of State.*
By C. J. ROGERS, *Deputy.*

Memorializing Congress to take favorable action on S. 36, or a similar bill, authorizing an appropriation for Federal aid in highway construction

Whereas the so-called public-land States are denied sovereignty over a great portion of their domain and are thus deprived of the income and revenues which would otherwise be derived from taxation of such areas, by reason where the Federal Government to a very great extent owes to such States the duty of building highways across such nonproductive areas; and

Whereas it has been customary in the past for the Congress of the United States to authorize an appropriation for Federal aid in highway construction for two years in advance and no such Federal aid has been authorized by Congress beyond the fiscal year 1933; and

Whereas the moneys appropriated by the Federal Government and used on highways reaches down directly to the workingman and is of direct benefit to a large number of laborers and others, thereby greatly relieving distress and suffering among the otherwise unemployed; and

Whereas the State of Wyoming has utilized all Federal aid heretofore authorized and the completion of the work now under construction will throw out of employment a large number of Wyoming citizens, thus adversely affecting several thousand residents of the State, unless additional funds for construction work are provided for the purpose of completing the Federal-aid system in this State; and

Whereas an authorization bill designated as S. 36 has already passed the United States Senate and has already been favorably reported to the House of Representatives by the House Committee on Roads: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the twenty-second legislature (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be and is hereby memorialized to take favorable and prompt action upon and to pass said S. 36, or a similar bill, authorizing a Federal-aid appropriation for highway construction in an amount consistent with other governmental expenditures at this time; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States be respectfully urged and requested to approve such bill upon its passage in order that the provisions thereof may become effective at an early date; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this joint memorial be sent to the President of the United States and the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the members of the congressional delegation of this State in Congress.

WM. M. JACK,
Speaker of the House.
ROY H. CAMERON,
President of the Senate.

Approved 8.40 a. m., February 7, 1933.

LESLIE A. MILLER, *Governor.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14458) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1201) thereon.

Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 5122) to provide for the purchase and sale of cotton under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, reported it with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and submitted a report (No. 1208) thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5427) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain lands in Ottawa County, Okla., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1202) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 5483) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior in behalf of Indians to purchase the allotments of deceased Indians, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1203) thereon.

Mr. STEIWER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10086) to amend the act of February 14, 1920, authorizing and directing the collection of fees for work done for the benefit of Indians, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1204) thereon.

Mr. WALSH of Montana, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9877) to repeal obsolete sections of the Revised Statutes omitted from the United States Code, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1205) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7121) to repeal obsolete statutes and to improve the United States Code, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1206) thereon.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 3257) for the protection of holders of industrial insurance policies in the District of Columbia, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1207) thereon.

Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 5532) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at Boca Chica, Tex., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1209) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 5564) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Hudson River at or near Catskill, Greene County, N. Y., and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1210) thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on to-day, February 11, 1933, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

- S. 914. An act for the relief of Katherine R. Theberge;
- S. 1858. An act for the relief of Harriette Olsen;
- S. 2144. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant a patent to certain lands to Charles R. Thornton;
- S. 2395. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain land to school district No. 15, Lincoln County, Mont.;
- S. 3504. An act for the relief of Lyman L. Miller; and
- S. 4166. An act for the relief of James M. Griffin, disbursing agent, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes.

GENEVIEVE M. COLWELL

Mr. KENDRICK, in behalf of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably the resolution (S. Res. 348) submitted by himself on the 6th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for miscellaneous items, fiscal year 1932, contingent fund of the Senate, to Genevieve M. Colwell, widow of Eugene Colwell, late the assistant financial clerk of the Senate, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

WATER RESOURCES OF THE SAN PEDRO RIVER, ARIZ.

Mr. KENDRICK, from the same committee, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 292) submitted by Mr. ASHURST on December 7, 1932, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation respecting proposed legislation providing for the ultimate utilization of the water resources of the San Pedro River, in the State of Arizona, including irrigation, reclamation, flood control, and power development. For the purposes of this resolution such committee or subcommittee is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, and to employ such clerical and stenographic assistance as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The committee or subcommittee is further authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to take testimony, and the expense attendant upon the work of the committee or subcommittee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, but shall not exceed \$2,000. Such committee or subcommittee shall make a report of the results of such investigation with recommendations to the Seventy-third Congress, first session.

ENLARGEMENT OF YELLOWSTONE AND GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. KENDRICK. Also, on behalf of the chairman [Mr. TOWNSEND], from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably Senate Resolution 226, submitted by my colleague [Mr. CAREY] and myself, which was referred to that committee with amendments by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 5, after the name "Department of the Interior," to strike out "and"; in line 6, after the word "company," to insert "the Teton Investment Co., the Teton Hotel Co., the Teton Transportation Co., and the Jackson Lake Lodge Co."; in line 12, before the word "methods," to strike out "The" and insert "What"; in the same line, before the word "employed," to insert "if any, have been"; on page 2, line 9, before the word "methods," to strike out "The" and insert "What"; in the same

line, before the word "employed," to insert "if any, have been"; in line 11, before the words "residents," to strike out "to harass" and insert "affecting"; in line 12, after the word "in," to strike out "order to bring about their removal from said lands" and insert "connection with its activities in acquiring land or otherwise promoting the project of enlarging the boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park and/or the Grand Teton National Park"; in line 17, after the word "Senate," to strike out "not later than December 1, 1932," and insert "as soon as practicable"; in line 24, after the word "Senate," to strike out "in the Seventy-second Congress"; and, in line 25, after the word "submitted," to insert "during the Seventy-third Congress," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to investigate the activities in the Jackson Hole region, Teton County, Wyo., of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, the Snake River Land Co., the Teton Investment Co., the Teton Hotel Co., the Teton Transportation Co., and the Jackson Lake Lodge Co., in connection with the proposed enlargement of the Yellowstone National Park and/or the Grand Teton National Park of Wyoming, particularly with a view to determining:

(a) What methods, if any, have been employed by the National Park Service to discourage persons from making entry and settlement on public land and forest reserves in said region so that the boundaries of said Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks might be conveniently extended, and the efforts made by the National Park Service to secure the cooperation of other bureaus and departments of the Government in discouraging, directly or indirectly, entry or residence on such public lands and in national forests; and

(b) What methods, if any, have been employed by the Snake River Land Co., or any of its agents, affecting residents and settlers on public lands and national forests in said region in connection with its activities in acquiring land or otherwise promoting the project of enlarging the boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park and/or the Grand Teton National Park.

The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the result of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate until the final report is submitted during the Seventy-third Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF A MESSENGER

Mr. FESS (for Mr. TOWNSEND), from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 337) submitted by himself on January 19, 1933, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 421, agreed to January 28, 1931, and previous resolutions authorizing Hon. THOMAS D. SCHALL, a Senator from the State of Minnesota, to appoint a messenger for service as his personal attendant, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, hereby are continued in full force and effect until otherwise ordered.

DAISY L. TRAMMELL

Mr. FESS, from the same committee, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 347) submitted by Mr. FLETCHER on the 6th instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for miscellaneous items, fiscal year 1932, contingent fund of the Senate, to Daisy L. Trammell, widow of Lee R. Trammell, late clerk in the office of Senator PARK TRAMMELL, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Mr. FESS, from the same committee, reported back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 344) sub-

mitted by Mr. SCHALL on January 31, 1933, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-second Congress, to send for persons, books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that there must be a mistake in the resolution. The Seventy-second Congress will expire on the 4th of March.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What is the request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is for unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution to authorize the Committee on Interoceanic Canals to hold hearings during the Seventy-second Congress. The Chair suggests that it probably should be the Seventy-third Congress.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What is the resolution?

Mr. FESS. It is a resolution to authorize the Committee on Interoceanic Canals to hold hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the committee have had no authority during this Congress to hold hearings, and the resolution is probably to cover the present session. The resolution will be again read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk again read the resolution.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I inquire what investigations or inquiries are in contemplation under the resolution?

Mr. FESS. The Senator from Ohio merely heard the statement of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL], who asked to have the resolution adopted. He does not know what the purpose of the Senator from Minnesota is.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think the resolution had better go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

SURVEY OF INDIAN CONDITIONS

Mr. FESS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I also report with an amendment Senate Resolution 323 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 323) submitted by Mr. FRAZIER on January 12, 1933. The amendment was on page 1, line 8, to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$1,500," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution No. 79, agreed to February 2, 1928, and continued by subsequent resolutions, authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, to make a general survey of the condition of the Indians in the United States, hereby is continued in full force and effect throughout the duration of the Seventy-third Congress, and hereby is authorized to expend in furtherance of above-mentioned purposes \$1,500 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for such purposes, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 5624) relating to the payment of benefits under the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, for disability not incurred in line of duty; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 5625) authorizing an appropriation to provide for the completion of the George Rogers Clark memorial at Vincennes, Ind.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FRAZIER (by departmental request):

A bill (S. 5626) to amend the act of June 23, 1926, reserving Rice Lake and contiguous lands for the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated below:

H. R. 811. An act for the relief of Martha Edwards, Norfolk Protestant Hospital, and Dr. Julian L. Rawls;

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of William L. Jenkins;

H. R. 999. An act for the relief of Lewis E. Green;

H. R. 1938. An act for the relief of Katherine G. Taylor;

H. R. 2188. An act for the relief of Arthur K. Finney;

H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of William Sheldon;

H. R. 3036. An act for the relief of Florence Mahoney;

H. R. 3607. An act for the relief of Dr. M. M. Brayshaw;

H. R. 3694. An act for the relief of Ada B. (Gould) Gollan;

H. R. 3727. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Fox;

H. R. 3848. An act for the relief of Ed Symes and wife, Elizabeth Symes, and certain other citizens of the State of Texas;

H. R. 5801. An act for the relief of Clyde W. Edwards;

H. R. 5947. An act for the relief of John Moore;

H. R. 6381. An act for the relief of Escha Whittington Casey;

H. R. 6618. An act for the relief of Lissie Maud Green;

H. R. 6774. An act to authorize amendment of the act of February 25, 1927, for the payment of damages caused by reason of the overflow of the Rio Grande on August 17, 1921;

H. R. 6785. An act for the relief of Jose Ramon Cordova;

H. R. 7040. An act for the relief of Sadie Bermi;

H. R. 7655. An act for the relief of Dr. Charles T. Granger;

H. R. 7761. An act for the relief of Mary Josephine Lobert;

H. R. 9606. An act for the relief of the estate of Clarendon Davis;

H. R. 9915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, adjudicate, and enter judgment on the claim of William W. McElrath against the United States for compensation for the manufacture of an invention of William W. McElrath covered by reissue letters patent issued by the Patent Office of the United States on the 19th day of February, 1924;

H. R. 10104. An act for the relief of the heirs of Burton S. Adams, deceased;

H. R. 10170. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of Joseph T. Ryerson & Son (Inc.);

H. R. 10891. An act to provide for the reimbursement of Guillermo Medina, hydrographic surveyor, for the value of personal effects lost in the capsizing of a Navy whaleboat off Galera Island, Gulf of Panama; and

H. R. 11477. An act for the relief of George Charles Walthers; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1825. An act for the relief of William M. Stoddard;

H. R. 6461. An act for the relief of Frank D. Whitfield;

H. R. 8619. An act for the relief of Nellie Oliver;

H. R. 9053. An act for the relief of Carl C. Baxter; and

H. R. 11035. An act for the relief of Price Huff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 10124. An act for the relief of A. Zappone, disbursing clerk, United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 10756. An act for the relief of Clive Sprouse and Robert F. Moore; and

H. R. 11242. An act to relinquish the title of the United States in and to lands in Rapides Parish, State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

TAMPICO MARINE IRON WORKS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 188) for the relief of Tampico Marine Iron Works, which were, on page 1, line 7, to strike out "\$2,573" and insert "\$1,500"; on page 2, line 4, to strike out "being" and insert "to be"; and on page 2, line 6, after "to," to insert "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or

received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 185)

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Fess] made a most informative speech concerning the Library of Congress. It is of public interest because it states in detail just exactly how the Library may be utilized by all our people. I am asking, therefore, unanimous consent that his speech may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I have just read a memorandum of the history and activities of the Federal Trade Commission, which I believe should be printed, and ask the consent of the Senate so to do.

The only legal machinery which has been constructed that has proven it is equipped to meet the industrial problems of to-day in the interest of the public is the Federal Trade Commission, and we should not throttle it now by lack of appropriations when in all the history of our Nation it is most needed. Without that machinery combination power would have by this time through its intricacies of combinations, had it not been for the Federal Trade Commission, strangled fair competition, honest business, the law of supply and demand.

The Federal Trade Commission was the first institution ever formed to really accomplish anything in the thwarting of combination power and unfair trade, and its enactment was only had after years of bitter controversial struggle. It is the result of years of investigation and study by commercial, industrial, and governmental committees and organizations. Its accumulated efficiency should not be thrown away.

This commission is to-day the only instrument we have in the field of public utilities outside the railroads to guard the people's interest.

We have appropriated for the Interstate Commerce Commission seven times the amount that the Bureau of the Budget has recommended for the necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, which is \$1,100,000. The Interstate Commerce Commission has only the railroads to look after while the Federal Trade Commission's jurisdiction includes everything else in the country excepting the banks. The railroad investment is only \$26,000,000,000 while the public utilities alone, outside of the railroads' investment, is \$20,000,000,000.

Now, Mr. President, the House proposed to cut this recommendation, which is already pared to the quick, to \$500,000. I protest that we should not cut off our noses to spite our faces or rather allow the public utilities and unfair combinations outside the railroads to deprive honest business wherever it is found throughout the country of a fair deal.

We have the Clayton Act, the Sherman Act, and the Webb-Pomerene Export Trade Act, and others; but, while there have been suspicions and rumors, never before had the facts been made certain and usable. Never before had there been competent evidence legal to go before a court. The Federal Trade Commission was organized September 26, 1914, with power, by one means or another under the law, to go into records, to get evidence, wherever that evidence could be found, to prove the things the country knew were going on, but had no means of legal proof. The men appointed went

fearlessly ahead and did their duty and secured evidence sufficient to convict criminally of violation of law and thereby have, to a large degree, put the fear of justice into the hearts of corrupt combinations that in no other way could have been deterred in their unlawful procedures and have thereby saved to the people a thousandfold their investment. Might as well recommend the discharge of the police force, the fire department, the cancellation of insurance policies.

Everybody knew there was collusion and combination in restraint of trade, and everybody still knows it, but heretofore there was no machinery to collect competent evidence. With the Federal Trade Commission in action, there is always the possibility of securing that evidence which is a deterrent to unscrupulous business.

While I congratulate the Senate Appropriations Committee upon its action raising the amount of appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission to \$780,000, as a move in the right direction, yet I can not help but feel that the Senate should take the Budget committee's advice and make the appropriation a million dollars. The Senate alone is saved more than that amount every session by being able to refer investigations to the Federal Trade Commission that would otherwise have to be undertaken by the Senate or the House, or both. This Federal Trade Commission was created in part to take off the shoulders of the House and the Senate these numerous investigations that were imperative from time to time; and, instead of having them investigated by special committees in a slipshod way by untrained investigators, we have within the Federal Trade Commission a body of trained economists, accountants, and statisticians who can in a fraction of the time make the same investigation that the Senate or the House would make at a small percentage of the cost.

Had not the war intervened, with its general blight on human progress, and through its dictatorial influence persuaded Congress to amend the original Federal Trade Commission act, which greatly limited its power, I believe that its service to the people would have reached a scope that would have made it entirely effective for the purpose for which it was created. Even in its limited scope it has served as a deterrent, and without it combination power would immediately suck the remaining independent vitality of the country. I hope that the Senate will not be penny-wise and dollar-foolish in this appropriation and subject, through its shortsightedness, independent farm and business to the Frankenstein of corporate combinations.

The Federal Trade Commission has proved its right to our confidence in spite of the attacks upon it by its enemies in their efforts to abolish, or at least curtail, its powers. Its members are able and fearless and honest and, if left undisturbed in their function, will prove an effective check to the all-absorbing power of the great financial trusts, who do not like the light which the Federal Trade Commission cause to shine into their darkest corners.

I ask also to have printed in the RECORD a statement in support of Federal Trade Commission appropriations made before the Senate Committee on Appropriations by Mrs. Harris T. Baldwin, chairman department of living costs, National League of Women Voters, and also the accompanying memorandum.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Press department, National League of Women Voters, 532 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.]

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS MADE BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE BY MRS. HARRIS T. BALDWIN, CHAIRMAN DEPARTMENT OF LIVING COSTS, NATIONAL LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Within its first year the attention of the National League of Women Voters was focused on the value of the work of the Federal Trade Commission because of its investigation of the packers which led to the consent decree of 1920 and the passage of the packers' and stockyards act in 1921. The members of the league in facing their problems as purchasers discovered that the most valuable source of light on business conditions affecting prices and the cost of living came from the investigations of the Federal Trade Commission. League members also found that they as individuals and even the States are practically helpless in dealing with the factors in the conduct of business which affect price and value, and that the only hope of reducing unfair trade practices

inimical to consumers was through the agency of the Federal Trade Commission.

Women, who are estimated to comprise 85 per cent of the country's buyers, are the victims of misbranding of products, false and misleading advertisements, price discriminations, imitation of brands and trade-marks, and substitution of products. We, therefore, feel personally grateful to the commission for its prosecution of cases involving fraudulent practices as to the quality, content, or merit of such commodities as silk, bread, aluminum, hosiery, soap, coal, cotton, cereal, milk, and many others of great importance to the public.

Utilization of electric resources from the standpoint of the public welfare and the regulation of public utilities have been among our major subjects of study. The electric-power investigation of the Federal Trade Commission ordered by Congress has been our most valuable source of impartial information in this field.

At the present time, under chaotic business conditions when the temptation is great to disregard normal fair-trade practices, consumers need more than ever a Government agency competent and available to guard the public interest which by its very presence services as a deterrent to the infringement of the rights of competitors and purchasers.

The action of the House by which it cut the appropriation by approximately \$1,000,000 on the score that the House committee "does not approve the initiation of new economic investigations at this time," reveals either a startling ignorance of the public need or a deliberate intent to lessen the control of the public over business practices. The theory that the Congress will provide special funds for the investigation it orders permits the disintegration of the trained force of investigators, increases the danger that investigations will be charged with being proposed from partisan political motives and entirely disregards the right of the public to ask for investigations and to maintain an agency with power to initiate its own investigation whenever the public interest appears to be endangered.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Origin and composition

The Federal Trade Commission was established by an act approved September 26, 1914. President Wilson shortly before had delivered a special message to the Congress upon the subject. The commission was the result of years of investigation and study by commercial, industrial, and governmental committees and organizations. A pledge to create such a commission was contained in the platforms of 1912 of the Republican, Democratic, and Progressive Parties. In addition to the duties and powers given by the act creating it, the commission was directed to enforce sections 2, 3, 7, and 8 of the Clayton Act approved October 15, 1914. It was also directed to administer and enforce the Webb-Pomerene export trade act, approved April 10, 1918.

The commission consists of five members, no more than three of whom shall be members of the same political party. There are at present only three commissioners, two Republicans and one Democrat. The term of one of the commissioners expired last September, and another died in January of this year.

Business practices and the public

The Federal Trade Commission is practically the only governmental agency to protect the public from exploitation by dishonest business. It is practically the only governmental agency protecting the honest business men from their dishonest rivals and the small business men from their more powerful and unscrupulous competitors. It is the only agency empowered and equipped to make thorough investigations of the conduct and practices of business generally as such affect the public welfare. It is the agency that through its investigation of public utilities has done most to expose the evils of high finance and those in powerful financial positions.

Results of power and gas inquiry

In the utility investigation, made at the direction of the Senate (S. Res. 83, 70th Cong., 1st sess.), the commission has exposed the vicious propaganda of the utility corporations through colleges, schools, governmental agencies, and the press. It has disclosed the use by many utility concerns of the most unreliable and inaccurate forms of accounting. It has shown an extensive padding of costs to operating companies through exorbitant fees charged for alleged services by holding companies, such fees amounting in some instances to 12 per cent of the cost of all additions, improvements, and replacements, and giving to the holding companies profits of over 100 per cent at a cost to the operating companies of millions of dollars. It has exposed capitalization of the earnings of subsidiary companies. It has shown an inflation of capitalization by deliberate appreciation or write-up of assets of more than \$1,000,000,000 in the concerns that to date have been put in the record, upon nearly all of which securities of some kind have been issued and sold to the investing public. These elements enter into and constitute a part of the base upon which the rates which the consumers pay are established. It has disclosed retention of control of a large number of operating companies by a small group through control of the common stock of holding companies and the issuance of nonvoting or preferred stock to the public.

As a direct result of the commission's investigation most of the utility information bureaus in the States for the preparation and dissemination of propaganda have been abolished. The joint committee here in Washington, a national propaganda agency, has been whittled down to nearly nothing. The dissolution of the National Electric Light Association has been announced, as has

also the intended abandonment of all propaganda activities. The Edison Electric Institute, newly organized, has announced a program of financial reform which, according to the statement of the director, is the direct result of the commission's inquiry, and if carried out will save the country hundreds of millions of dollars. Many of the utility companies have already reversed numerous improper entries and practices and have largely reduced or abolished so-called management and service fees. Many concerns have reduced substantially the amounts of appreciation or write-ups (watered stock). One concern upon which public hearings were recently held had at the time the commission analyzed its records in preparation for the public hearings \$102,000,000 of write-ups or appreciation. When the public hearing was held this appreciation had been reduced to \$30,000,000. In a large number of instances rates to consumers have been reduced following the commission's investigation and exposure of the elements that had been incorporated into the base upon which the previous rates had been established. These changes have resulted in direct savings to the public of millions of dollars. One company has stated that \$2,600,000 had been saved in two years by residential customers as a result of a reduction by it in rates after the commission's investigation. Detailed information as to these things can be furnished if it is desired.

Final report on utility investigation

While public hearings in the utility investigation will end this fiscal year, many utility concerns will not have been investigated and put in the record. Some of these are Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, Gas Service Co., Stone & Webster (Inc.), Duke Power Co., the United Light & Power Co., United Gas Corporation, Natural Gas Co. of America, and others. Very few gas concerns will have been covered by the investigation. These concerns are daily becoming of more importance and are covering the United States with pipe lines from Texas and Kansas to the Canadian border and the Atlantic Ocean.

This investigation is one of the largest ever undertaken by any governmental department or agency. It involves an investigation and study of the practices, organization, relationship, conduct, and management of utility corporations throughout the United States. The organization, management, and relationship of many of these corporations are very complicated and complex. Some of the holding companies have as many as 250 to 400 subsidiaries and affiliates. In order to trace the growth, development, and relationship of these corporations it is necessary to review their records for periods of from 10 to 20 years. There are involved an investigation and study of much the same character for utilities as are required of the Interstate Commerce Commission in its efforts to value the railroads. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been working for 20 years upon this valuation, and there has been appropriated for such work approximately \$45,000,000. The electric and gas utility companies constitute an industry comparable in size to the national railway system. The public utilities represent an investment of about \$20,000,000,000, as compared with about \$26,000,000,000 invested in the railroads.

The commission has made, considering the magnitude of the task, an efficient and speedy investigation with the forces available. It never has been given the appropriation requested for this investigation. The final report upon this investigation can not be completed by the end of this fiscal year. It is necessary, in order to prepare efficiently such report, that those familiar with the investigation have charge of its preparation. With the appropriation provided by the House of Representatives it will be impossible to expeditiously and efficiently prepare the final report for the Congress. The action of the House almost completely wipes out the division of the commission which largely conducted this investigation and makes it impossible for the commission to efficiently continue the investigation should the President or Congress later direct.

Value of the commission's work to the public

It has been testified that the commission action in the so-called Pittsburgh plus case against the United States Steel Corporation saved the farmers of the Middle West alone \$30,000,000 a year. By preventing false and misleading advertising and misbranding, following the decision of the Supreme Court in *Federal Trade Commission v. Winsted Hosiery Co.*, 258 U. S. 483, in which the commission ordered the Winsted Hosiery Co. to cease and desist selling cotton goods as and for wool, the commission has saved the public generally millions of dollars annually.

One of the earliest cases the commission had in court was against a chain mail-order house directing it to cease and desist misrepresenting its products and falsely disparaging and defaming competitors. This action of the commission was upheld by the court. (*Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Federal Trade Commission*, 258 Fed. 307.)

In another case the commission protected the cooperative method of marketing grain and established the right of farmer organizations, grain growers, and shippers to admission to the trading places, preventing a monopoly in the grain trade. (*Federal Trade Commission v. Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis*.)

The commission also prevents such unlawful practices as price-fixing agreements, unlawful price discrimination, inducing breach of competitors' contracts, false defamation of competitors, and false disparagement of competitors' products, commercial bribery, unlawful secret rebates, the use of fictitious mark-up prices, espionage, selling goods below cost to injure competitors and to destroy competition, substitution of products, conspiracies in restraint of trade, bogus independents, trade boycotts, etc.

Cooperation with other departments

In performing its work the commission has not duplicated or trespassed upon the work of any other department or agency. It handles and reaches matters that can not be reached by other agencies or departments of the Government, as is evidenced by the fact that many other departments and agencies send to it matters coming to their attention which they can not handle. The office of the Solicitor of the Post Office Department has sent cases of alleged false and misleading advertising and misbranding which that office could not handle to the commission for action and the commission has stopped the practices. The same is true of the food and drug division of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce.

Some of the most important cases of the Department of Justice under the Sherman Act to protect the public from monopolies and restraints of trade have been as a result of investigations conducted by the Federal Trade Commission, which were referred to the Department of Justice. Among these were the cases against the Cement Manufacturers Protective Association, General Outdoor Advertising Co., Maine Cooperative Sardine Co., Southern Hardware Jobbers Association, Maple Flooring Manufacturers Association, Radio Corporation, and Bolt and Nut Association. In practically all of these cases decrees were obtained by the department. The case now being conducted by the Department of Justice against the Sugar Institute in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York resulted from an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission which was referred to the department.

Duties imposed by statutes and present status of work

Congress, by statute, has imposed upon this commission the duty of preventing unfair methods of competition, unlawful tying and exclusive dealing contracts, unlawful price discrimination, unlawful acquisition of stock of competitors, interlocking directorates, and the administration of the export trade act. In these matters the commission has no discretion. The Supreme Court, in *Federal Trade Commission v. Gratz* (253 U. S. 421), held that unfair methods of competition include practices which are opposed to good morals because characterized by deception, bad faith, fraud or oppression, and practices against public policy because of their dangerous tendency unduly to hinder competition or create monopoly. In compliance with these duties the commission had pending on December 31, 1932, 411 preliminary inquiries, 425 applications for complaint, 183 complaints charging violations of law, 9 court cases, and 8 export trade investigations. Within the last 10 days the commission has obtained favorable decisions in 3 of these court cases, 1 from the Supreme Court and 2 from lower Federal courts.

Fifty-one export law associations, representing about 1,000 producers, manufacturers, and distributors located in all parts of the United States, have taken advantage of the provisions of the export trade act under the supervision of the commission. The purpose of that law is to promote exports from the United States to foreign countries and to enable American exporters to operate on equal terms with their competitors abroad. Associations are required to file with the commission documents and reports covering their organization and operation. If the commission has reason to believe that an association is in violation of the law, it conducts an investigation and makes recommendations for the adjustment of the association's business. This involves continuing supervision of these associations and this work by the Federal Trade Commission.

The fact-finding functions of the commission

The commission is the economic fact-finding body of the Government designed to protect the public from unfair and wrongful business practices. Section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission act contemplates special investigations upon the initiative of the commission, such as were planned for next year, and at the direction of the President or either House of the Congress, and the maintenance of a staff to make such investigations. Many of these have saved the consumer millions of dollars. The investigation now being conducted upon the initiative of the commission into price bases has resulted in substantially lower prices on cement because of the elimination of the so-called plus fictitious freight rate from fixed basing points rather than from point of manufacture and shipment.

To perform its duties under section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission act and in connection with the prevention of the practices condemned by the acts which the commission enforces, the commission must keep a limited number of trained investigating economists, accountants, and statisticians. Many of these now with the commission have been continuously engaged in investigations of the organization, conduct, and business practices of corporations and business concerns for a period of nearly 30 years. They constitute an important economic, accounting, and research organization. The personnel of the old Bureau of Corporations of the Department of Commerce, created about 1903 upon the recommendation of President Theodore Roosevelt, was transferred to the Federal Trade Commission upon its organization in 1915. There came from that bureau a staff of 93. The commission's estimates for 1934 provide for a staff of only 102 for such work.

Special investigations

The commission has conducted 73 special broad investigations under section 6 of its act. The commission has power to make such investigations upon its own initiative (par. (a), (b), and (c)), at the direction of the President or either House of Congress (par. (d)), and upon application of the Attorney General (par. (e)).

Five of these 73 have been at the direction of the President, 44 at the direction of the Senate, 8 at the direction of the House of Representatives, 2 upon application of the Attorney General, and 14 upon the commission's own initiative. Many of these have resulted in court action to prevent unlawful practices or in remedial legislation. Some of these investigations so resulting are: Cooperation in American export trade, farm implements, food inquiry, Lumber Trade Association, radio, and newsprint paper. For a brief description of each of these 73 investigations see annual report of the commission for 1932, pages 261-269.

Proposed investigations

The broad investigations the commission proposed to undertake next year are most important and of widespread public interest. They are:

1. Financial practices of corporations:

Resolved, That the commission undertake, as soon as present work and appropriations available permit, an inquiry into (1) the facts regarding the form, adequacy, and accuracy of published financial reports made to stockholders and others by corporations engaged in interstate commerce, excluding banks, common carriers, and public utilities; (2) the effects of the financial practices of corporations prior to and since the stock-market collapse of 1929, including the volume and extent of corporation call loans; issuance of bonds and preferred stocks, accompanied by stock-purchase warrants or rights to subscribe; profits and losses of corporations from operations in the stock and bond markets; stock and script dividend issues of corporations; overexpansion through reinvestment of earnings; officers' salaries and bonuses; participation of officers and directors in underwriting and syndicate operations in securities of their corporations; and purchases from and sales to their corporations of securities or other property; (3) the facts regarding concentration of the voting control of corporations through nonvoting and management stock and the effects thereof on the financial practices and methods of corporations; (4) all other financial practices or methods affecting the public, all with a view to determining whether the commission shall recommend to the Congress any changes in or additions to existing laws.

2. Effect of antitrust laws on industries exploiting natural resources:

Resolved, That the commission undertake as soon as present work and appropriations available permit an inquiry into the effects of the antitrust acts with relation to the industries engaged in the exploitation of petroleum, natural gas, coal, and lumber and the advantages or disadvantages to business and to the general public of agreements of competing concerns in such industries with regard to prices, margins, production, profits, markets, territory, and any other similar agreement or arrangement affecting competition, and the like advantages or disadvantages in such industries of concentration of financial control and of combinations of plants, including the costs and profits of single and multiple plant operation, with a view to determining whether the commission shall recommend to the Congress any changes in or additions to existing law.

3. Effects of certain competitive practices widely engaged in:

Resolved, That the commission undertake as soon as the present work and appropriations available permit an inquiry into the facts regarding quantity discounts, selling below cost, reciprocity in dealing, brand advertising, guarantee against decline, wholesale and retail price stabilization and the effects of each on business and the general public with a view to determining whether the commission shall recommend to the Congress any changes in existing law.

They concern matters often discussed in the last presidential campaign, referred to in the platforms of both political parties, and are the subjects of discussion among business men, lawyers, and economists throughout the country, as is shown by the memoranda inserted in the record of the hearing before the subcommittee of the House of Representatives at pages 257 and 263.

Summary of work done

Since its organization and to June 30, 1932, the commission has instituted 20,206 preliminary inquiries, of which 6,124 have resulted in the docketing of applications for complaint and 13,659 have been dismissed after investigation. During the same period the commission has docketed 6,933 applications for complaints. Of these, 1,270 were disposed of by the proposed respondent stipulating to abandon the practice complained of, 3,564 were dismissed after full investigation, and in 1,717 of them complaints were issued. During the same period the commission has issued 2,054 complaints, of which 37 were disposed of by the respondent stipulating to abandon the practice complained of, 671 were dismissed after hearing, and in 1,143 of which orders to cease and desist were issued. During the same period the commission has instituted and disposed of 375 investigations under the export trade act. To June 30, 1932, the commission has been involved in 209 cases in the Federal courts. It has been successful in 112 of these and 97 of them have resulted in decisions against the position taken by the commission. It must be remembered that the vast majority of the cases in which the commission issues orders to cease and desist are never taken to court, the respondents complying with the orders. It is only the closest and most doubtful action of the commission that is taken to court. This commission is breaking new ground and preventing practices that could not before be reached under the law.

The entire work of the commission to the end of the present fiscal year will have been done with a maximum annual appropriation of \$1,864,800, a minimum annual appropriation of \$430,-

964, and an average annual appropriation of \$1,196,393.99; a maximum annual number of employees of 663, for the year 1918, a minimum annual number of employees of 214, and an average annual number of employees of 352.

Appropriation cut 65 per cent by the House of Representatives

The commission voluntarily cut its estimates for the next fiscal year from \$1,466,500, the appropriation for this fiscal year, which is more than 20 per cent below the appropriation for the previous fiscal year, to \$1,300,000, a reduction of over 11 per cent. The Bureau of the Budget reduced the amount to \$1,109,550, excluding the legislative furlough, a reduction of over 24 per cent from the appropriation for the present fiscal year. The House of Representatives authorizes \$510,000, a reduction of over 65 per cent from the appropriation for this fiscal year and of over 54 per cent from the Budget estimate.

The total reduction in the independent offices appropriation bill by the House of Representatives for the next fiscal year is but a little over 2 per cent from the appropriation for the present fiscal year. The total reduction from the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget is but one-sixth of 1 per cent.

Out of a total decrease in this bill below the Budget estimate of \$1,657,522, \$1,000,000 is from the sum for the Supreme Court Building upon the assurance that that \$1,000,000 is not needed now, and \$599,550 is from this one agency, the Federal Trade Commission, leaving a reduction of only \$57,972 for all other agencies included in the bill. The reduction for this commission with a Budget estimate of only \$1,109,550, amounts to more than 86 per cent of the total reduction from the Budget estimates in a bill proposing an appropriation of \$1,002,890,779 for 32 separate offices and agencies.

The President-elect advocated a cut of 25 per cent in Government expenses. The amount allowed by the Bureau of the Budget amounts to a 24½ per cent cut for this commission.

Effect of the cut

The cut means and is in effect a scrapping of the commission. The commission could in no way effectively discharge the duties imposed upon it by the statutes. Out of this sum of \$500,000 must come the salaries of the commissioners and the expenses of their offices, the expenses of the Secretary's office, the expenses for the sections of accounts and personnel, docket, mail, and files, etc., which must be maintained. There would remain only between \$300,000 and \$350,000 for all other purposes of the commission, including supplies, travel, witness fees, salaries, reporting service, etc. This would mean almost a complete elimination of law-enforcement work and almost a total abolition of the economic division. With only \$10,000 for printing it will be impossible for the commission to enforce its orders to cease and desist. The commission's orders to cease and desist can only be enforced through the Circuit Courts of Appeals. In these courts the commission must file a printed copy of the record in addition to briefs and petitions. The printed records and briefs and petitions through the Government Printing Office cost on an average of from \$3,500 to \$5,000 a case. The commission, in addition to such expense, has the printing expense involved in the release of its decisions, reports, etc.

Reduction of personnel

The commission's appropriation for the fiscal year 1933 provided for 427 employees. The commission's estimates for the fiscal year 1934 covered 376 employees, the permanent staff only. All contingent and temporary employees that had been engaged upon the various investigations being conducted by the commission were to be released at the end of the present fiscal year. This was a reduction of 51 employees. As a result of the reduction of the commission's estimates by the Bureau of the Budget there remained provision for 336 employees, a further reduction of 40, which would have to be made from the permanent staff. The bill as passed by the House would leave the commission with only 131 employees, a reduction of 205 from the figure covered by the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget and 296 less than the staff for the present fiscal year. This would practically wipe out the economic division and completely destroy the branch investigatory offices of the commission located at New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and Seattle.

Loss of trained personnel

The action of the House means a cessation at the end of the present fiscal year of practically all of the commission's work and the scattering and loss of its especially trained personnel. And if the commission were to be given adequate funds for the following fiscal year it would be impossible to reassemble the present highly trained personnel consisting of lawyers trained in this particular phase of work, investigating statisticians, accountants, and economists, all of whom are necessary to the proper discharge of the duties imposed upon the commission by law. This would mean a much less efficient administration of the law during the years, it would require to again train adequate efficient personnel. The commission in its estimates for 1934 requested only enough to maintain its permanent personnel, asking nothing for contingent or temporary personnel. Without this highly trained, permanent personnel upon which expansion can be made for the particular needs of the particular moment, it would be impossible for the commission to properly perform its functions under the acts. By this action of the House of Representatives the commission would be so crippled as to make it wholly inefficient and useless for any purposes that the incoming administration may have with respect to it.

LXXVI—242

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Elimination by House of Bureau of the Budget estimates for special investigations..... | \$288,134 |
| House reduction from Bureau of the Budget estimates for law enforcement activities of the commission..... | 311,416 |

| | |
|--|---------|
| Total reduction for the commission by House from Bureau of Budget estimates..... | 599,550 |
|--|---------|

COMMENTS ON THE EXISTING DEPRESSION BY HON. ELMER THOMAS, SENATOR FROM OKLAHOMA

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask leave to have published in the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on the 6th instant, being comments on the existing depression.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and it is as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen of New York, I call upon you to-night to face the facts.

We are now in the forty-first month of the worst depression in history.

While all know of the effects, yet practically no two agree as to either the cause of or the remedy for the economic and personal distress now existing among our people.

For over two years the responsible head and the policy-making branch of the Government refused to acknowledge the existence of a depression. The third year was given over to the enactment and administration of measures for relief, and as the result we now have 10 Federal agencies loaning Federal credit to the States, cities, counties, and to industry, large and small, throughout the country. Dozens of bills are now pending in the Congress proposing to extend the provisions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act so that practically all may share in the Federal doles.

During the past 12 months, the Government, acting through its loaning agencies, distributed over \$3,000,000,000 in credit to industry and to the public. During the same time the Federal reserve system placed in circulation over eleven hundred million dollars through the purchase of Government bonds and obligations. Simultaneously the national banks, acting under the Borah amendment to the home loan bank act, added some \$150,000,000 to the circulation.

The credit distributed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was used by borrowers to pay bank loans, taxes, interest, and expenses, hence has had but a single result—keeping the wolves from their doors for a few months, or for perhaps another year.

The money the Federal reserve system paid the banks for their bonds was returned immediately to liquidate indebtedness due the Federal reserve banks.

The money placed in circulation by the national banks, acting under the Borah amendment, was withdrawn immediately by the Federal reserve system through the resale of a portion of its bond purchases.

While the relief measures distributed over four and one-half billions of credit and currency, yet on January 26, 1933, we had \$35,000,000 less in circulation than on January 1, 1932, one year ago, when the relief measures were inaugurated.

On January 26 we had \$115,000,000 less in circulation than on August 1, only six months ago. During the past three years almost twenty billions of credit, termed deposit money, have been withdrawn, canceled, and destroyed.

Because of these continued policies of deflation of credit and currency economic conditions and personal distress are more acute to-day than when the present policies of relief were begun.

As a member of the policy-making branch of the Government, and one who has been in many parts of the United States during the past few months, I come to New York, the Nation's metropolis, to present the facts and to reason with you—you, and you alone, who can give the order and set in motion the machinery which will check the downward trend and start the greatest, strongest, and richest nation of the earth upward toward economic and human recovery.

What are the conditions to-day?

Millions are unemployed, trade is stagnated, business is paralyzed, taxes are in arrears, interest is in default, law is ignored, and individuals, corporations, cities, counties, States, and the Federal Government are using the Nation's credit with which to pay taxes, interest, and to meet the overhead and running expenses of our several organizations.

Why are conditions thus?

Why are our people, corporations, cities, counties, and States forced to borrow from the Government?

The answer: Because there are no other institutions or agencies able or willing to extend such credit.

Why are the regular institutions and agencies unable or unwilling to take care of such demands?

The answer: Because our people, our institutions, our municipalities and our States are without income and ability to meet their existing obligations, and therefore are not good risks for further credit.

When will conditions improve?

The answer: When the people regain buying power, when the unemployed have jobs, and when farmers have cost of production—then will trade be revived, taxes and interest will be paid,

value will reenter commodities, farms, and factories, and the prosperity we once knew will again return.

Standing here in the center of New York, the richest and most influential city of the earth, let me digress to say that New York, your city and our city, does not live and exist off Manhattan Island.

If immediately surrounded by an impregnable wall your people would be starving maniacs and your institutions would suffer destruction within the course of days.

The greatness, prosperity, and happiness of New York are the greatness, prosperity, and happiness of the prairies of the West, the plantations of the South, and of the hundreds of millions of peoples of not only America but of the world.

When the masses prosper, all who live off the masses enjoy prosperity; but when the masses are impoverished, all others borrow from the Government and ask quick and easy bankruptcy as a possible means of relief.

What is the cause of existing and growing distress?

It would seem that we have everything necessary to make a people prosperous, contented, and happy.

We have the richest, strongest, and most influential Nation of the earth.

We have almost one-half the monetary gold of the world.

We have a magnificently developed country.

We have food, clothing, and merchandise in abundance; and we have an industrious, ambitious, and a patient people—but something is wrong, something is missing, a cog in our economic machinery is worn, damaged, or destroyed.

What is this something wrong, this something missing, and this something destroyed?

For what do wage earners work, toil, and sweat?

For what do farmers work throughout the long hot days and into the nighttime?

For what do merchants buy and sell?

For what does industry hazard programs of activity?

The answer: Without exception, each and all plan, work, and slave, if need be, to secure that which buys bread, clothing, and shelter; that which pays taxes, interest, and debts; and that thing which all want and which all must have—money—and money for many is neither possessed, found, nor even seen.

Gentlemen of New York, face the facts. Sound business and prosperity increase in proportion as sound money and credit expand.

At the risk of boredom permit me for a moment to indulge in figures.

In 1912 the amount of money in circulation was three and one-third billion dollars. From 1912 to 1921 the money in circulation increased from three and one-third to six and one-half billion dollars.

In 1920, with the greatest amount of money ever in circulation, we had the highest prices and the best times in history.

In 1920 influential powers decided that prices were too high and such powers, sometimes wise, decided to bring down or cheapen prices by increasing the value of the dollar.

This was done by withdrawing money from circulation, thereby making money scarce, and at the same time increasing its purchasing power.

The program was inaugurated. One-third of the money of the people was withdrawn from circulation. Deflation was in progress. The value of the dollar went up, and the prices of commodities, farm lands, real estate, and property generally tumbled down.

The plan from the viewpoint of its powerful sponsors worked. It was a complete success, and to-day we have the highest valued dollar and the consequent lowest prices in history.

Wheat is the lowest priced in 400 years; hogs and livestock the lowest in a century; and other commodity prices and property values generally low in proportion; and yet these powerful influences responsible for this economic crime and tragedy seem to wonder why our economic structure is near collapse.

If increasing the volume of money in circulation from 1912 to 1920 was responsible for the general increase in commodity prices and values; and if from 1921 to 1933 the decrease of the currency and the destruction of credit were responsible for the general fall in prices, then why are we not justified in concluding that a reversal of the present policy of deflation would bring an end to the present depression and start the Nation on the upturn toward economic recovery and prosperity?

With conditions as they are to-day, it is not a question of whether we want to check deflation—not whether such check is desirable—but the demand is mandatory that an end to deflation be brought about and at once.

Even an end to deflation will not suffice.

The dollar has value and buying power which it can not retain if the poise, peace, and equilibrium of our people are to be maintained.

In support of this conclusion, I direct your attention to the following facts:

From the most reliable estimates we must concede that the total massed debts of the people amount to at least \$200,000,000,000. Most of this indebtedness was contracted immediately prior to, during, and immediately after 1920, and at a time when the value of the dollar ranged from 40 to 60 cents.

To-day we can not liquidate this indebtedness with 50-cent dollars, not even with 100-cent dollars, but to get rid of these bonds, notes, mortgages, and installments, we must pay with 160-cent dollars.

Hence it must be plain that instead of the people owing massed debts in the sum of \$200,000,000,000, they must earn, save, and pay value to the extent of \$320,000,000,000 to liquidate such indebtedness.

To further, illustrate—of the bonds issued by the Government during and immediately following the World War, some \$20,000,000,000 remain unpaid.

For such bonds, when issued, the people obtained value on the basis of a dollar's worth from 40 to 60 cents; but to-day to liquidate such bonds the people must pay on the basis of a 160-cent dollar. Hence, instead of the people owing \$20,000,000,000 in Government bonds they owe \$32,000,000,000 of value as represented by such bonds.

I next call your attention to the tax burden of the Nation. It costs the people annually some \$5,000,000,000 to run the Federal Government.

It costs the people of the States, cities, counties, and districts annually some \$7,000,000,000 more to pay their local expenses; hence, the people must earn and pay each year some \$12,000,000,000 to meet their tax obligations.

But can they pay with \$12,000,000,000 of value?

Most certainly they can not.

Instead of being able to pay with \$12,000,000,000 of value they must pay in 160-cent dollars, which, when computed, forces the people to part with wealth in the total sum of \$19,200,000,000 to meet their annual tax bills.

If this analysis and interpretation are correct, do you still wonder why taxes are not being paid?

Let me recapitulate briefly.

The people to-day owe value covered by bonds, notes, and installments in a total sum of over three hundred and twenty billions. The people owe interest on this gigantic debt, and such interest must be paid with 160-cent dollars.

The people owe annual taxes, Federal, State, county, city, and district, in the total sum of over \$12,000,000,000, but in order to meet such assessments, obligations, and demands they must part with almost twenty billions of value and wealth; therefore, in order for the people to pay their taxes and interest they must part with value and wealth caused by the present 160-cent dollar in a total sum approximating the present annual income of the people.

Yet some wonder why taxes are not being paid, why interest, notes, and bonds are in default, and why millions of our people are walking the streets looking for shelter and begging for bread.

The people are not paying their taxes, and they are not paying their interest and their debts, because they are unable to secure these high-priced dollars with which to meet their obligations.

To demand and insist that they meet a 50-cent obligation with a dollar and a half payment is nothing short of oppression, rapacity, and extortion.

The people understand fully the predicament in which they find themselves.

But congressional leaders do not appear to understand, and as fast as time and occasion permit, such misrepresentatives of the people are being exiled to private life.

The new administration is to have its opportunity. If it fails or hesitates, the isle of exile will be crowded because the "forgotten man" still lives.

Is there no relief, help, and aid possible for the people of the country?

Relief, to be worthy the name, must go further than Federal loans and doles to industry, the States, counties, cities, and even to the people of the Nation. Relief in the form of loans and doles only postpones the day of economic death.

Relief, to be of benefit, must mean employment, must mean cost of production, and must mean expanding and growing purchasing power in the hands and pockets of the masses of the people of the country.

Can such relief be provided?

Reason with me for an additional moment.

If the expansion of the currency and credit from 1912 to 1920 caused a general increase in commodity and property prices, and if the deflation of the currency and credit from 1920 to 1930 caused a general decline in commodity and property prices, then who can deny that a reversal of the present policy of deflation and the inauguration of reasonable and controlled expansion of currency and credit would bring an up-turn in business and resultant hope to countless millions now on the verge of despair?

To-day the powerful influences controlling the economic and political policies of America are making the bond market the barometer of prosperity.

Do not understand me to say, or even to intimate, that I am not ever mindful and always jealous of the credit of our Government, but I remind you that all bond interest and principal are paid by sweat, by toil, and by products created by the labor and the genius of our people.

Hence, instead of relying wholly upon the bond market as the barometer of business, I would create a prosperity barometer resting not alone upon the bond market, but also upon the commodity markets, the property markets and the general welfare of our people.

If conditions are as represented, and if such conditions have been brought about in whole or in part by a manipulation of money and credit, then who is responsible for what President Hoover concedes to be the "worst depression in history"?

Under the Constitution the Congress, and only the Congress, can coin money and regulate its value. This responsibility is fixed. The power abides inherently and exclusively in the policy-making branch of the Government; but from a practical standpoint the Congress is either unable or unwilling to assert and exercise such specially conferred and expressed constitutional power.

Notwithstanding the plain mandate of the Constitution, as a rule financial policies do not originate with the Congress.

As a rule, they do not even originate in Washington.

When I stated a few moments ago that "you, and you alone, can give the order and set in motion the machinery" which will pull us out of the mire, I meant that the financial policies of America originate right here in this great city.

The New York Federal Reserve Bank is the head and heart dominating and controlling the fiscal policies of our Government. Working and cooperating with this financial institution are the great banks of New York City.

The policies of these banks are controlled by the wisest financial brains of the Nation, and such control, as might be expected, is exercised always in the interests of the stockholders of such institutions.

The heads of these powerful banks, together with their economic and financial advisors, have, as a practical proposition, Washington and the Congress as their agents.

To-day the Government at Washington is only one of the clients of this unified and powerful financial aggregation.

A nod and a whisper by the powers mentioned can turn the tide and reverse the processes of deflation and depression. The longer the signal is delayed the more terrible the penalty now certain to be inflicted.

The people forming the cities, counties, States, and even the Federal Government are bankrupt and prostrate. Because of their condition moratoriums are being declared and enforced. Judges are silent, the law is impotent, and the tide of resentment and condemnation is sweeping eastward across the continent.

In conclusion, if the present financial policies are not altered; if deflation is not checked; if the people are not to be permitted to even have a chance to retain their property—a chance to pay their taxes—a chance to meet their interest, and a chance to pay their honest debts, then a new issue will arise—the form, extent, and result of which can not now be foretold.

Bankers of New York, I plead with you to face the facts, meet the issue, and permit the people and the Nation to live.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I present for publication in the RECORD an address by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] in an open forum in New York City on February 6, 1933, on the subject "The Way Out."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: It is a common saying that the depression or the panic or whatever name may be used to characterize the condition in which America finds itself is unprecedented. I wonder how many who are studying this problem realize that modern conditions, the elements that enter in, the luxuries and necessities of our everyday life are unprecedented. The last 50 years as compared to all previous conditions surrounding civilized people is as different as though we were in a new world. In every department of human life from the lowest to the highest there has been a miraculous change in the conditions surrounding every department.

The discoveries of science, the practical application of these discoveries, has forever made obsolete the condition heretofore obtaining. It is needless for me to recite these. On the farm modern implements have revolutionized the processes incident to production. Mechanical devices have largely supplanted man and animal power. In the home, the farm home, electric lights, refrigerators, have taken the place of and become necessary for the proper comfort of the farm home. The radio has brought to these isolated places both matters of interest and amusement from the world at large. The hard-surface road, the automobile, have made possible the personal contact of the far-distant places and erstwhile isolated homes with the great centers of population.

In manufacturing, labor-saving devices have revolutionized industry and made possible a mass production superior in quantity and quality to meet the need of the millions now constituting the population of the earth. Never before in the history of civilization have the necessities and luxuries of life been so easily, abundantly, and perfectly produced. The production of the raw material and the finished article have reached the stage of the miraculous. All this change has been brought about by the urge of humanity for better living conditions, conveniences in the home, the elimination of isolation, the suppression of disease, the gratification of the desire for relaxation, pleasure, and amusement.

The marvelous discoveries of genius and their practical application have made all these possible and yet these modern conveniences, all these revelations of modern progress, are being converted into a withering curse to the masses of mankind. The arguments heard upon the floor of Congress is that the present horrible depression has been brought about by extravagance. Just how far is this true; just to what extent do the actual ne-

cessities of modern life exceed in cost the necessities of the old tallow candle, and the horse and buggy, or in other words the old conditions. The argument is heard that in order to relieve this condition we must revert to the old order.

Does anyone believe that the amount of money either in the form of credit or currency per capita that sufficed heretofore can meet the requirements of normal modern life?

In 1913 there was enacted into law the Federal reserve act. The passage of this act was clearly in response to a demand for a more flexible currency, one that would meet more adequately the demand for an expanded currency and credit and which would domestically at least expand and contract approximately according to the amount of wealth available for distribution. Almost from the beginning of the operation of this law the conditions throughout the world insofar as they affected America were such as to test the practical use and efficiency of this new law.

From 1913, after this law became operative, bank failures in America began to decline and steadily declined until 1919, when there was not a single bank failure in all America. Credits were easily obtained and in the main wisely used. Commodities both raw and finished were freely used as the basis for a temporary currency and a consequent satisfactory credit. From 1915 to 1920, despite the destructive influence of a world's war, America never saw such an era of prosperity. Farm products had risen for the first time in my knowledge of farming to a profitable price. Old debts that had been incurred under the old rigid and restrictive currency laws were liquidated. Farm implements were purchased, farm mortgages were lifted, outbuildings were repaired and freshly painted. Everything produced on the farm found an eager and adequate market. Labor was amply paid for service. Factories were running at full time. All methods of transportation were carrying capacity tonnage.

The authors of the Federal reserve act, viewing with pride the manner in which it met a world's crisis and during this period saw the splendid prosperity of America, boasted that never again could there be a money panic. Cotton rose to 35 and 40 cents a pound, wheat to \$2 and \$3 a bushel. Labor was receiving ample and adequate wages.

The cost of living during this period was high, but the means of meeting that cost were adequate and satisfactory. Happiness, contentment, characterized the people. Enterprise was stimulated throughout the country. The masses were buoyant with satisfaction and hope. Our schools were packed with pupils; our colleges and higher institutions of learning were filled to capacity. In a word, credit and capital were abundant to move profitably the wealth produced by the teeming masses of America.

And then there came a frost, a chilling, deadly frost, without rhyme or reason. A crime was perpetrated that blasted the hopes of millions of Americans and changed overnight the sunshine of prosperity into the deadly darkness of despair. On May 20, 1920, the governors of the Federal Reserve Board, their officers and advisory council, met in executive session and decreed that America was too prosperous; that money was too abundant, credit too easy, the people too happy, and therefore it must cease. They decreed that the circulating medium must be restricted, credits must be drastically curtailed, that all temporary currency must be withdrawn. There was established by them for the banks of the country a maximum or what they termed a base line of credit, beyond which a progressive and graduated discount rate should be applied. The normal rate had been greatly increased below this base line. So mercilessly determined were they that deflation should be immediately accomplished that in one Federal reserve district, through the application of their graduated and progressive rate of interest, one bank in this Federal reserve district was charged 87½ per cent. The result was immediate and horrible. This action did not alone destroy the credit of the people but it did infinitely worse than that. It destroyed their confidence in the financial institutions of this country. They lost faith in the laws upon which they had fondly believed their prosperity was firmly based. Obligations incurred which could have been easily met had the conditions been left alone were now made an intolerable obligation. To visualize the startling effect of this action on the part of our banks and bankers it is sufficient to cite the fact that in less than 24 months cotton dropped from 40 cents a pound to around 8 and 10, wheat in like proportions, all farm products in practically the same degree.

It is to be noted that when deflation was determined upon our bank officials did not call an international conference to determine that there should be deflation. They met in America, the conference composed wholly of American bankers met in the city of Washington, and they there and then began effectively to deflate. And now that we have reached the horrid condition that deflation has brought, the slogan is that in order to relieve the condition that is the inevitable result of deflation we must call—America must call—an international conference to restore prosperity to America. We are told that there is as much or perhaps more money in existence in America to-day than there was during the time of prosperity. And therefore there should be no attempt to increase the currency supply and expand the credit possibilities of this country. This condition then proves the falsity of the statement that our Federal reserve act made the conditions in which we now are impossible. If the volume of money in America is as great to-day as it was from 1915 to 1920, where is it and why is it not available to relieve this unprecedented panic? Our laws certainly permit this retirement and hoarding of money in the hands of the few. And the result is that destitution and want, bankruptcy and despair, is universal in spite of an abundance, a superabundance

of foodstuffs, clothing, building material, in fact, every commodity needed for human comfort and luxury. Is Congress and the people of America impotent in the premises? Are our currency laws such that our national-bank officials can decree a contraction of the currency to the stagnation and ruin of business, enabling a few, a favored few, to get possession of the money of the country and to hoard it in banks and private places?

The Constitution provides that Congress shall have the power to coin money and regulate its value. The present situation coming as it has over a period of years, growing worse each day, involving thousands of bank failures, the ruin of the credit of sovereign States, impoverishing millions, is an indictment of the courage and patriotism of Congress and the financiers of America. The answer to this condition domestically is inflation, a radical inflation, until the terrible distress and debts are relieved.

Deflation was fatal enough to the masses of the people, but as though this were not enough to condemn America to certain ruin and bankruptcy, there was erected an iniquitous tariff wall that made impossible any slight amelioration or improvement in the distressing conditions. Therefore, in conclusion, let the incoming Congress address itself to see to it that the currency and credit shall be made abundantly available for the American people and that our tariff shall be so modified that easy and profitable trade in our abundant surplus may be had with the nations of the earth. The condition of this country is epitomized in that homely verse which says:

"The toad beneath the harrow knows
Exactly where the tooth point goes;
The butterfly upon the road
Preaches contentment to the toad."

The suffering people have grown weary and resentful of the butterfly preachment.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14199) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, there is lying on the desks of Senators my proposed amendment to the pending Army appropriation bill, being House bill 14199. Day before yesterday I filed written notice of a motion to suspend the rules so that this amendment might be considered on the Army appropriation bill.

Early in January there came to my attention exceedingly great distress being suffered by young boys and young men, all the way from 14 to 25 years of age. They were tramping the country widely, without any resources or any place to go. As a result of that information, I introduced a bill which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], the chairman of that committee, referred the bill to a subcommittee of which the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] was chairman. I spoke to the Senator from Iowa about hearings on the bill because there was certain information that I thought the committee ought to have with respect to the distressing conditions. The subcommittee, however, did not hold any hearings, and I understand reported the bill to the full committee on Military Affairs, and the full committee in turn reported it to the Senate unfavorably. I am quite convinced that the members of the Committee on Military Affairs did not have adequate information to pass upon the bill; and I further desire to point out that there is a public impression that the War Department has disapproved of this plan. That is not accurate.

First, I want to invite the attention of the Senate to just what this amendment provides. It is not long; it is very simple. It provides:

SEC. —. That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to provide for the admission to any military post of the United States, without enlistment in the Army, of any unmarried male person between the ages of 17 and 24, both inclusive, who is without means of support and who shall apply at any such post within one year after the date of enactment of this act and give satisfactory evidence to the commanding officer thereof that he is unemployed at the time of application and that he has been continuously unemployed for at least six months prior to such time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question there?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I ask the Senator whether he has made an effort to ascertain the number of persons who might thus become eligible to admission to military posts under his amendment?

Mr. COUZENS. Yes; I intend to cover that a little later and to refer to the evidence submitted to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well; I will wait without further question.

Mr. COUZENS. Continuing the reading of the amendment in line 2, on page 2:

The Secretary of War shall further provide for housing, feeding, and clothing any such person upon his admission to any such post for a period of not to exceed one year from the date of enactment of this act.

Any person admitted to any military post pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 1 of this section shall, so far as practicable, be subject to the customary discipline maintained at such post and shall participate in all forms of beneficial and healthful exercise.

Any person admitted to any military post pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 1 of this section who shall withdraw permanently from such post, or who shall absent himself temporarily therefrom without the authority of the commanding officer thereof, shall no longer be entitled to the benefits of this section at such post.

The Secretary of War is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Is it intended that these boys shall have the training and the opportunity for study such as are afforded boys admitted to the Military Academy?

Mr. COUZENS. No; there is no provision to that effect; but they will have to conform to the customary discipline of the military post.

In that connection I want to say that the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] has an amendment to propose to come in after line 10, on page 2, which I think will improve the bill very much, but I am not going to comment on that now, because the Senator from Iowa will do that. However, I want to emphasize, Mr. President, the War Department has not disapproved of this bill. In response to an inquiry sent to the War Department by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee [Mr. REED] the department replied in a communication addressed to him on January 27, as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR REED: Careful consideration has been given to the bill S. 5363, "A bill to provide for the housing, feeding, and clothing of certain unemployed persons at military posts of the United States," which you transmitted at the War Department under date of January 23, 1933, with a request for the views of the War Department relative thereto.

While the bill does not give the total number to be cared for, it is understood that Senator COUZENS has mentioned a figure—300,000.

If the Army were assigned this task, it would adopt the general principles of the citizens' military training camp idea as the basis of its solution. This would conform to the bill, which recognizes no enlisted status and no obligation on the part of the United States which might later serve as the basis of claims against the Government. The men would be sheltered, fed, clothed, would pursue active course of basic infantry drill and recreation, would be disciplined on the basis of section 2 and section 3 of the bill, and would be discharged upon application. Unlike the citizens' military training camp student, a greater measure of self-sustaining work would be required of him, his ration allowance would be less, and his clothing would be only that absolutely necessary to meet the requirements of each individual case. Where military outer garments were used, they would be uniformly dyed.

Difficulties in the solution of this problem arise when we reach the question of shelter, unless it is proposed to assemble a large proportion of the applicants in southern climates, where tentage could be used throughout all periods of the year. Our records show that approximately 25,000 could be accommodated throughout the nine corps areas in permanent barracks, and approximately 43,000 in temporary barracks. This gives us a total of 68,000. Any increment above 68,000 would have to be sheltered in tents.

However, all-year encampment would be practicable only in the Fourth, Eighth, and Ninth Corps Areas.

Without much change in Regular Army personnel, excepting medical, another 20,000 beds could be provided in tents at southern stations. Any increase over 88,000 beds, however, requires expensive construction and increased officer and enlisted personnel from the Reserve Corps.

The Army could draw from its current stocks and from war reserve the supplies and equipment necessary for this undertaking, but all current stocks would have to be immediately replaced, as current budgetary allowances are now at the very minimum. In addition, certain reserve stocks, especially tentage, would also have to be replaced, as such items as tentage are critical in our plans to meet emergencies and our supply of tentage is now low. It must be pointed out also that it is very expensive to house troops under canvas. Each tent costs approximately \$40, and tentage soon wears out when constantly used.

While the War Department is fully sympathetic with the purposes of this bill and is anxious to contribute in the present emergency, a careful study of this whole plan shows that the aims of the bill could be better and more economically accomplished by localizing the problem in our cities, where a large majority of these young men are now found, by using for their shelter buildings which could be made available by the local communities. If such buildings were made available for this purpose, the Army could install in each the necessary equipment and a small Regular Army group to supervise messing, housing, sanitation, and the control of the unemployed assigned to the particular unit. Such a plan would involve much less in the way of public funds and Army equipment. The unemployed taking advantage of this shelter could be required to conform to certain rules and regulations, including prescribed exercises, and the governing personnel from the Regular Army, as they circulated among the unemployed and dealt with them, would have many opportunities to make a right impression upon the unemployed group and do much good work of this kind, which would go far in molding a better morale throughout the men so housed, to the end that criminal tendencies might be lessened and respect for Government augmented.

With the passing of the emergency these men would be better located for absorption in the normal life of the Nation than they would be if concentrated in large camps or cantonments.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK J. HURLEY,
Secretary of War.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a few questions in order that I may better understand just what is involved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. COUZENS. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. First of all, the age limit is between 17 and 24. In time of war, with the consent of their parents, boys as young as 16 may enlist, and I am just wondering if the Senator felt it unwise to reduce the age limit to 16?

Mr. COUZENS. I wish to say to the Senator I did not. I drew this bill merely tentatively, and it is subject to amendment according to the judgment of the Senate. I have been advised by a number of Senators that they think the age limit is too high in one place and not low enough in the other.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is my thought.

Mr. COUZENS. And if it is the sense of the Senate that the age limits should be changed, I am entirely agreeable to it.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. COUZENS. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has the Senator any estimate of the number of men between the ages of, say, 16 and 21 who are out of employment?

Mr. COUZENS. I am coming to that, Mr. President. I am going to discuss the evidence that was submitted to the Committee on Manufactures that deals with that problem.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will not anticipate the Senator. May I ask him another question? As I listened to the number of men that would be cared for in permanent buildings and tents, roughly, it seemed to me that perhaps 75,000 or 80,000 might be taken care of.

Mr. REED. Eighty-eight thousand?

Mr. TYDINGS. Eighty-eight thousand. I did not make the exact calculation. Does the Senator intend to limit the number to 88,000?

Mr. COUZENS. My intention would be, Mr. President, to limit it to the capacity estimated by the War Department. I have no intention of asking for the increase of any per-

manent facility. I want to come to that question a little later, too.

Mr. TYDINGS. One other question: I note in the report of the War Department that they say that perhaps these young men could be better cared for in the buildings in their cities. That is a natural inference; but I think the Senator knows that the buildings that could be utilized for that purpose are already pretty well crowded.

Mr. COUZENS. I desire to say in that connection that I think the War Department have confused the issue, because, as the amendment points out, it is not my intention to include the older men; and in most of these cities, particularly in Detroit, the buildings to which the War Department refers are occupied by older men who are machinists and mechanics and laborers who are out of work.

That is not the group I am trying to reach. That group will have to be taken care of by other ways and means. I am trying to look after the youth who probably never has had a job and has been driven away from home because of economic conditions that his family have encountered through no responsibility of their own.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. GLENN. Does the Senator contemplate any training or education or drills?

Mr. COUZENS. The amendment provides for any exercise or drilling or training that the commanding officer may prescribe. In other words, the amendment provides that the rules and regulations shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Assuming that the full capacity of 88,000 young men is taken into account, has the Senator any approximate figure as to what the 88,000 would cost the Government over a period of a year?

Mr. COUZENS. I have no estimate of that, because I did not attempt it, for the very reason that I have no knowledge whatever as to how many boys would avail themselves of this opportunity. There may be a large number or there may be a few. What I provided in the amendment was that when the Army ascertained its needs in that connection it would have to ask for appropriations from Congress; but the Senator from Maryland, perhaps, knows more about the cost and the care of those youths in the camps than I do.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was wondering, if the Senator will permit, whether the Senator from Pennsylvania would give us the maintenance cost of a soldier outside of his pay.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. REED. There has not been much time to make a comprehensive study of this matter; but I asked the War Department to give me the best figures they could get on it, based on the estimate of the Senator from Michigan of 300,000.

Mr. COUZENS. Just a minute, Mr. President. I do not want the Senate misled by estimating 300,000, because I am not asking to take care of more than 88,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we get the figure of 300,000, we can reduce it to 88,000 ourselves.

Mr. COUZENS. I do not want the impression to go over the Senate that that figure that is presented is going to be the cost to the Government, so I prefer to have it reduced to the cost of the number I propose rather than the cost of the whole unemployed youth of the Nation.

Mr. REED. Very good. Then I have it also broken down to so much per man for each item. The estimate, I suppose, would be no greater per man if the load were limited to 88,000, though, obviously, the more men there are the cheaper it is to take care of them on the average.

Based on the number of 300,000, the estimate for buildings and quarters per man per year is \$68.

Subsistence per man per year, \$73.

Clothing and equipage, \$116.

Medical attention, \$18.

Transportation; that is, to these tent camps in the South, \$6.

Reserve personnel, because there is nobody else to command them, \$84 per man per year.

It totals about \$365 or \$366 per man per year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Again making a very hasty calculation, it looks as though perhaps twenty-five or thirty million dollars would be required for 88,000.

Mr. REED. For 300,000 men, the estimated additional appropriation needed would be \$109,674,800.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I decline to yield to confuse the issue.

Mr. REED. I do not want to confuse the issue.

Mr. COUZENS. The issue is entirely confused, because no such number is in contemplation; and I object to the injection of problematical numbers that are not contemplated under the amendment which I have.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit an observation, even taking the figures of the Senator from Pennsylvania it would cost only about \$25,000,000 to take care of the 88,000 boys he has in mind, assuming that the proportionate cost was the same.

Mr. COUZENS. I have not all of the items; but, if the Senator will hand them to me, I want to point out the absurdity of some of these items as applied to each one of the probable 88,000.

Mr. REED. It amounts to about a dollar per day per man. I had not heard of the Senator's intention of limiting the number to 88,000. If I had, I would not have had these figures prepared on the 300,000 basis.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, the information I get from the War Department is that the actual food costs, which is the primary cost, is 30 cents a day—30 cents a day for feeding a young man who is in distress because of economic conditions.

I want to point out in that connection that much of the work that is estimated here in this memorandum prepared by the Senator from Pennsylvania, or which has been prepared for the Senator from Pennsylvania can be done by the boys themselves. There is no contemplation of any transportation cost.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. REED. How are we going to get these boys down to these southern tent camps?

Mr. COUZENS. They will apply wherever they are, the same as they are doing now. They are tramping the highways. They will apply to any camp where they choose, and the amendment makes no provision for transporting them. They will have to apply themselves. There is no provision or thought of furnishing transportation.

Mr. REED. Certainly there is no room on Governors Island for all that would apply at New York City.

Mr. COUZENS. They could not take any more than there are facilities for. I am not asking that the Army facilities be increased.

The Senator has pointed out in these figures that the reserve personnel amounts to \$84 per year per man, when the War Department in their reply said there would be no such charge. The War Department in their letter to the Senator from Pennsylvania said specifically, with respect to the 20,000 in the South:

Without much change in Regular Army personnel excepting medical service another 20,000 beds could be provided in tents in the southern stations.

There is no occasion whatever for augmenting the Regular Army appropriations to the extent of \$84 per year for each individual cared for.

Mr. President, it is inconceivable that to supervise these boys would cost \$84 for the supervision of each and every boy. It is just a deliberate attempt to misrepresent the cost to the Government.

In any event, however, I am not going to rest this proposal simply on the question of cost. There is much more at issue than the matter of cost. Assuming, for instance,

that all of these figures submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania were correct—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I do not know whether they are correct or not. They are the answer that I get from the War Department in reply to my inquiry. I do not vouch for them.

Mr. COUZENS. I said to the Senator, assuming that the figures he presents are correct, it would take less than a third of the estimated amount with all of their estimates for each activity per man. The amount would be reduced by more than two-thirds if we accepted all of these figures under the provision of the amendment, because there is no provision in the amendment for extending permanent Government facilities.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. COUZENS. Certainly.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Assuming that 80,000—possibly a less number, but assuming 80,000—should apply to be given relief, has the Senator estimated about how much it would cost?

Mr. COUZENS. No; I have not estimated how much it is going to cost, because I do not care what it is going to cost.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I am entirely in sympathy with the Senator. I merely wanted that information if he has made an estimate.

Mr. COUZENS. I want at this point to say that I am not disposed to waste Government money; and I am in full sympathy with the bill presented by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] and made an addition to or a part of the so-called Costigan-La Follette bill, which is now on the Senate Calendar. I say that because their proposal is not confined to boys. Their proposal is for transient unemployed boys and men. My proposal is confined to youths.

If the Congress wants to provide for the facilities contemplated in the so-called Cutting bill, I am in favor of it, because I realize that the provision I am proposing to the Congress in no way conflicts with that proposal. In other words, there are probably a million men outside of the category to which I am referring who are transient and in need of assistance and who could be provided for under the so-called Cutting bill. It does not seem that I should have to stress the need of taking care of boys from 15 or 16 to 21 years of age who are tramping the country, with no economic resources, coming in contact with all kinds of dissolute men and women, or that I should have to emphasize the fact that it is a Federal responsibility to do something with those 300,000 boys.

I submit that this proposal will take care of only 88,000, and at the most extravagant estimate the cost would be a dollar a day. That is \$88,000 a day. Are we justified in spending \$88,000 a day to preserve this group of youngsters who have the future conduct of the country in hand? Is it necessary that I emphasize the fact that we have a great army set-up, for which we spend from \$300,000,000 to \$500,000,000 a year, that is already equipped with facilities, with personnel and opportunities for caring for these youths, all of which is admitted by the War Department?

They do not deny their ability to care for the 88,000 young men. The War Department has not even opposed the idea of their being required to look after the youth. Certainly, Mr. President, if we could go out and drive these men to war, if we could pick them out of the cities, out of their homes, and send them to France, we can, when the cost would be much less and when the purpose would be far better, use the same facilities for their care that we used for driving them into war.

Mr. President, I am no pacifist. I never voted against adequate defense. I have voted for every proposal to maintain an adequate Army and Navy. I am unwilling, however, to deny the use of these facilities in times of peace to a large group of our citizens, our boys and youth, who need them. I am unable to understand anyone standing up in this body and opposing a proposal to take care of 88,000 of the best young men of the country, who have never had an oppor-

tunity, never an opportunity for a job; who, in the last three years, during the most terrific economic depression, have tramped the country without any opportunity of getting a job.

Mr. President, most of these young men have never had a job. What are we going to do about them? Are we to let them keep on tramping and going around in circles, being killed on railroads and encountering disease and crime while we stand idly by, with an Army and Navy fully equipped with facilities and personnel for their care?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HASTINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator contemplate that the boys to whom he refers, if sent to these camps, will receive military training?

Mr. COUZENS. No; I had not thought of that. The bill provides that the Secretary of War shall prescribe rules and regulations for their care.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator think that some provision ought to be made for giving them some sort of training? Nothing could be more demoralizing in a military organization than to have a lot of fellows loafing around an army post doing nothing.

Mr. COUZENS. There is a provision in the bill, which the Senator will find if he reads it, that rules and regulations are to be provided by the Secretary of War. I have not attempted to deal with the details. I know nothing about military training; I have never participated in it; and I am perfectly willing to leave that, if the Senate agrees, to the rules and regulations provided by the Secretary of War.

Mr. CLARK. Does the bill provide that the Secretary of War shall have the right and duty of providing training?

Mr. COUZENS. "Rules and regulations," it says, and I can not contemplate what rules and regulations will be prescribed, but I still insist that the proposal is open to amendment or modification or change. The fundamental principle back of the proposal, however, is that the facilities of the War and Navy Departments, of the War Department in particular, shall not remain idle while thousands and thousands of our boys tramp the highways, with no place to live.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. In reference to the question asked by the Senator from Missouri, I desire to offer an amendment to the Senator's amendment, on page 2, line 10, to strike out the period and to add the following words: "and vocational training, as far as practicable with available facilities."

Mr. COUZENS. I think that would greatly improve the bill, because if there are facilities in the camps for teaching the boys anything along the lines of agriculture or anything else, I would want them to have that opportunity.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I must make a point of order against any amendment's being offered by the Senator from Iowa, because the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is not before the Senate.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I was not offering it at this time. I said I had an intention to offer it at the proper time.

Mr. REED. Of course, the Senator from Michigan could accept any modification he wished to accept to the amendment he has sent to the desk.

Mr. COUZENS. When the matter is reached, I will accept the amendment. But I had hoped there would be a disposition in the Senate to waive suspension of the rules and permit this matter to be voted on on its merits. I appreciate that in order to get a suspension of the rules I must have a two-thirds vote. I hope that not only will I get a two-thirds vote but that I will get a nine-tenths vote. However, I would prefer to have the matter passed on its merits rather than under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think this proposal has real merit in it, and I certainly am inclined, from what little study I have made of it, to support it. I hope the Senator from Michigan will not mind if I make what might be called a controversial observation, but I make it out of pure good faith, and in great seriousness.

May I point out that we are appropriating \$9,440,000 a year for prohibition enforcement? I am not questioning those who favor that appropriation, but I point out that 94,400 men at a hundred dollars a year could be taken care of out of that one appropriation, and it seems to me that in a time such as that in which we find ourselves it would be wiser, in the interest of humanity, to transfer that sum to a work that has behind it so many fine impulses as has the proposition offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, the Senator knows I have always been a wet, and have never changed my mind about the unwisdom of the eighteenth amendment, so he and I will not differ so far as his attitude on the wet question is concerned.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if we are short of money, if we have not the money necessary, it would be much better to use the money appropriated for prohibition enforcement for the purpose the Senator has in mind, than to spend it on a lot of prohibition agents seeking to enforce an impossible proposition.

Mr. COUZENS. This talk about insufficient money is getting terribly disgusting. We appropriate millions for the protection of migratory birds, and, though it is hard to believe, there is complaint because some of us want to appropriate money for the care of migratory boys. What kind of sense is there in such action of Congress? Mr. President, is it any wonder that the country, editorially and otherwise, is condemning the futility of maintaining a Congress and proposing the setting up of a Mussolini, or autocrat, or dictator, or whatever he may be called?

Not only that, but if we go through the appropriations of possibly \$2,000,000,000, other than those for fixed charges, which I shall not discuss, we will find that there are millions and millions of dollars used for purposes much less admirable than providing for these boys. Just reflect on the millions of dollars that are spent for looking after insects and birds and pigs; yet there is objection to such a proposal as I have made, and the suggestion that I be required to get the assent of two-thirds before a vote may be had on the matter on its merits.

Mr. President, we are spending millions of dollars for reforestation, the benefits from which we will not get for from 30 to 50 years. I propose that the Government spend a few million dollars for benefits we can get beginning to-day, and yet there is resistance to it.

Mr. President, a subcommittee of the Committee on Manufactures of the Senate held hearings on Senate bill 5121, introduced by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING], with which, as I have heretofore said, I am in entire sympathy. But I submit that the proposals provided in the Cutting bill could not be operative for some time. It would not take care of all the conditions. My bill provides for taking care of the younger men, but there is a provision in the Cutting bill for taking care of the older men.

I am not attempting to confuse the issue. I do not want any one of these 88,000 boys who might be taken care of under my proposal roaming the country and saying, "My country does not care a damn where I go or what I do. They did care a lot when they wanted me to go to save their hides in France."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if they are 16 years old, they were not born then.

Mr. COUZENS. Well, the Senator from Pennsylvania can be as sarcastic as he likes. They are the same group of

boys and the same classification of boys who, the Senator knows, went to war in 1917. Some of the boys who would be provided for under this measure, if the age stays at 24, were cognizant of the conditions during the war.

Does the Senator mean to imply that because the boys were not born at that time they do not know anything about the conditions and the suffering and the sacrifices made by their brothers and parents? Certainly they did. The Senator may shrug his shoulders and throw his glasses down in disgust as he always does when it comes to considering human affairs.

Going back to the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Manufactures on the bill of Senator CUTTING—

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, before the Senator goes to that question, I trust he will permit one or two questions. I appreciate that the personal service in connection with these cantonments, or camps, will cost the Government hardly a penny, nothing outside of the supervisory expense. That is, all of the sanitation, patrolling, building, mess, and all other personal service, in all probability would be required to be performed by the boys and men in the respective camps. So that the only cost for personal services would be the supervisory cost of expert mechanics, expert carpenters, and a few others who would be necessary to supervise and direct the construction and all the other activities of the camp. Therefore the cost would be very greatly reduced when the personal service is to come from the men in the camps themselves.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, it seems to me that is perfectly obvious. If the Senate wants to make more sure about that, it can amend the proposal to accomplish that purpose. I do not contemplate that these boys will be waited on hand and foot by butlers or uniformed Army officials. I expect that they will be required to do everything that is humanly possible for them to do within the camp, and the Senator from Wisconsin hits the nail on the head when he says that all that will be needed, practically, will be food and supervision and such clothes as may be necessary. We do not know what clothes the boys already have. It may not be necessary to spend any money for clothes for a year. Yet it is provided in the estimates furnished by the War Department that the clothing alone would take \$116 per year per man. Mr. President, just think of estimating the clothing of these young men at \$116 a year per man.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, would they have to have a medical examination before going into the camps?

Mr. COUZENS. No. Of course, anybody who wants to defeat this proposal can present all kinds of facts in the way of expenditures and other things which they think will help defeat it. But this is not a question of dealing with details. This is a national, fundamental question, which must be dealt with on a broad scale and not be hobbled with a lot of restrictions which will discourage somebody from undertaking a big project.

Mr. President, I want to refer again to the estimates and some of the conditions which exist. Some question has been raised as to my estimate of the number of young men who are tramping the Nation without any facilities and who are able to say, "I have nowhere to go." Whether the boys will accept this proposal of mine or not I do not know, but at least they will be forever estopped from saying that their Nation took no interest in them and left them or put them in a position to say, "I have no place to go." I want the youth of the country to know that the country at least does provide some place to go.

In the hearings before the Subcommittee on Manufactures on page 9 appears the following:

Of the 3,257 men from whom age information was secured, 2,393 or 73.5 per cent of the total were under 41 years of age. The number under 22 years of age was 655 or 20.1 per cent of the total.

A little later I shall give some further evidence, but this is the basis of my contention that there are about 300,000 of these boys, because the testimony further shows that there are from 1,250,000 to 1,500,000 of unemployed transient

men and boys and 20 per cent of that number would be about 300,000.

There was testimony before the Committee on Manufactures with respect to the activities of unemployment camps in California. The testimony clearly indicates it was a very worth-while undertaking. My plan would not interfere with any such work. But I want to point out that in the testimony submitted to the Committee on Manufactures, as shown on page 13, the 3,950 young men and boys counted came from practically every State in the Union, so it is quite clear that it is a national problem.

In other words, there were from the State of Michigan 127 men being cared for in California. There were 122 men from the State of Pennsylvania being cared for in California, 180 from the State of New York, 182 from the State of Illinois, 48 from Massachusetts, 89 from Missouri, 29 from New Jersey, 6 from New Hampshire, 3 from Rhode Island, 29 from South Carolina, 71 from Colorado, 16 from Connecticut, 20 from Georgia, and 31 from Idaho. I mention these to indicate that it is a national problem. There is no reason why the State of California or any other State should be burdened with a problem which is purely national and especially when the National Government has the facilities to care for at least 80,000 of these men with little or no expense.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Does the record show where the camp is in California to which the Senator referred, and the number we are caring for there?

Mr. COUZENS. On page 13 of the hearings the Senator will find the names of the camps. There are some 13 camps in all in California. In that list of age groups it shows that under 21 years of age there were 20.1 per cent; from 22 to 30 years of age, 31.7 per cent; from 31 to 40 years of age, 21.7 per cent; from 41 to 50 years of age, 14.8 per cent; and over 50 years of age, 11.7 per cent.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. In all, as the record shows, in the different camps our people in California are taking care of about how many?

Mr. COUZENS. There are 3,951 recapitulated in this report.

In the hearings, beginning on page 23, there is testimony from Miss Grace Abbott, Chief of the Children's Bureau in Washington. As I understand her testimony, the evidence she had from the special agent of the Southern Pacific Railway was that in 1927 more than 50 per cent of the trespassers on railway property and trains were men of middle age and older. In later years the older men have largely disappeared, and it would be their estimate that 75 per cent of the 1932 trespassers range in age from 16 to 25 years. That is largely the basis of the ages which I have provided in my amendment. If 25 is too old in the judgment of the Senate and 17 is not young enough, I am perfectly willing to modify it so as to have the facilities of the Government used for the protection of the youth of the land of younger ages.

I want to refer again to page 26 of the hearings, which indicates the number of injuries among the youth and the older men who have been compelled to travel the country because of lack of work. It shows that there were trespassers killed and injured on trains and in train-service accidents—this information coming from the Interstate Commerce Commission—403 boys under the age of 14 in 1928; 372 in 1929; 278 in 1930; 278 in 1931; and 324 in 1932. There were youths between the ages of 14 and 21 killed to the number of 655 from 1914 to 1922, while in 1932 the number had increased to 1,184. Young boys from 14 to 21 years of age are being killed in accidents on the railroads in their efforts to go from place to place seeking jobs. Most of these boys, it is perfectly obvious, have never had a job, and the testimony is complete that most of them were driven from home because of economic conditions in their families. They would not stay home and see the food

taken out of the mouths of their younger brothers and sisters while they perforce sat idly by and could do nothing to care for themselves.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. COUZENS. Certainly.

Mr. GLASS. Some of us would be interested to have the Senator's views as to the difference in principle between the plan he is now proposing and the things that have already been done by the Congress and are now proposed to be done. In other words, several hundred million dollars have been taken out of the Treasury and loaned to States to defray the cost of taking care of the destitute, and there is a proposition pending to appropriate \$500,000,000 more to be given to the States for the same purpose. Aside from the feasibility of what the Senator from Michigan is proposing, I should like to be told what is the difference in principle between what we have already done and what he is proposing to do.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I think the principle is much more in favor of my proposal, because my proposal provides for using facilities which the Government already has on hand. With a complacency almost impossible to realize, the Government has sat by while \$1,500,000,000 of the Government's credit at least, and possibly the taxpayer's money before we get through, has been used for the purpose of keeping going those who are already well off and well to do.

(At this point a message was received from the House of Representatives, and other business intervened, which appears after the speech of Mr. COUZENS.)

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, in the testimony before the Committee on Manufactures there appears testimony given by the chief of police of the New York Central Railway under date of January 13, 1933. I quote from page 24:

It is generally known, however, that in recent years the number of young men between the ages of 18 and 20 riding trains has increased alarmingly. This is due in part to the difficulty experienced by boys on leaving school to obtain employment and who then use the trains as transportation to other places where they believe work may be found. One thing we have noted, that is, that persons apprehended for illegally riding trains represent every possible trade and profession.

In the testimony submitted by the chief special agent of the Missouri Pacific Railroad, he said (p. 35):

We took official notice, in 1928, of 13,745 transients, trespassers that we found on our trains and property.

In 1929 that figure was 13,875.

In 1930 we took a record of 23,892.

In 1931 that volume jumped to 186,028.

So, Mr. President, it is quite evident in what condition the unemployed transient is to-day.

On page 42 of the hearings there appears testimony to the effect that of the unemployed boys appearing at Phoenix, Ariz., 15 per cent were under 21 years of age.

On page 45 Professor McMillen, who did some work for the Department of Labor, testified:

I think it is undoubtedly true that fully 60 per cent are under 30 years of age, and about 25 per cent are under 21 years of age.

On page 50 of the testimony I again quote Professor McMillen, where he says:

I talked with an 18-year old boy in the camp at Big Basin. His attitude was touching. He told me he came from Mississippi and that he had been living around there amongst various married brothers and sisters and he had gotten to the point where he was definitely a dependent wherever he was living because there was no employment for him; so he had struck out, hoping to make his own way. He found it very tough going and when California opened up her arms and let him go to a camp where he knew he could eat and have a place to sleep, his gratitude was very great indeed.

That is just an example of the gratitude that at least 80,000 boys would have if they had an opportunity to get an adequate place to sleep and some food.

On page 61 of the same hearings, testimony appears as follows:

The boys, for instance, are gradually growing harder and more difficult to adjust. They are joining the professional group of

homeless men; they are becoming diseased, crippled, are growing accustomed to the road, and if employment were offered many of them would not accept it.

A prolongation of this condition is only making the condition worse; and here we have facilities all ready to undertake the solution of this problem in part.

I recognize that these uniformed West Point officials do not like the task of looking after these boys, but it is not a question in these days of what we like or do not like; it is a question of using every facility and every chance we have for relieving the present conditions.

I again make reference to the total number of boys who, it is estimated, are tramping the country.

On page 63 of the hearings Mr. Nels Anderson, instructor in sociology, Columbia University, testified:

The cities that we have heard from report a total of 256,124 persons, which seems to be about one-fifth or one-sixth of the homeless and transients in the United States.

If that is the proper percentage, it would be about 1,300,000 altogether, of which 20 per cent would be 260,000.

Again, there appears on page 67 of the testimony this statement:

This would bring my estimate of homeless in the United States up to nearly 2,000,000. I have, at other times, estimated 3,000,000, which is probably too high. The estimates run from 2,000,000 to 5,000,000, so I am giving you a very conservative figure here.

I again refer to the fact that all the testimony indicates that about 20 per cent of the transient unemployed are boys within the ages I have discussed.

On page 68 reference is made to the type of boy that usually starts out on his own:

The road draws out a younger, more able-bodied type of person. Older men stay in the large cities.

On page 69 of the hearings testimony appears from the same Professor Anderson with respect to the fact that this is an intercity problem. I will not go to the extent of reading it all; but if anyone is interested in determining whether this is an intercity problem, he may find the evidence to that effect.

On page 72 of the record there appears testimony from a Los Angeles witness to the effect that out of 3,000 there were 1,000 boys under 21 years of age who passed through the police station in a short period of time. On page 73 of the testimony there appears the following:

Last summer a study of police statistics of Los Angeles indicated that in the period of six months 10,000 boys had passed through the hands of the vagabond squad. That meant those 10,000 boys had spent a night in jail, appeared in the night court, had been given 30 days with 29 days suspended, and told by the police that the following day they would have to leave the city.

Mr. President, these boys are kicked around from place to place, with the opportunity of saying that no thought is given for their welfare or no facilities provided for them.

On page 74 of the testimony there appears the following statement:

To review the present policy, it is "move on" for the men, except for a relatively small number which are absorbed by our camps. It is "move on" for the boys, except a fortunate small number which are taken by a private agency, the community boys' lodge, and for whom personal plans and adjustments are worked out.

Mr. President, even the girls and the women are suffering to some extent in accordance with our principle "Women first and girls first"; they do not suffer the same conditions the boys suffer.

On page 78 there is testimony given by Mr. William R. Lovejoy, secretary of the New York Children's Aid Society. He testified to this effect:

There is also a serious effect on health. These boys, wandering from place to place, hitch-hiking, and bumming their way across the country, or riding the rods on the trains, living in jungles and camps, are exposed to a very direct danger to their health. The spread of venereal and other communicable diseases is becoming marked in many sections of the country, and we have noticed that in New York.

As to the effect on morals, it is impossible to make any generalization that would be of any value, although I believe our judgment would indicate that if a boy had gone clear across the country hunting for a job and has simply been moved on from

place to place and finding that there was no job, and continue several months or years in his search, he will end the search by hoping that he will not find one.

Mr. President, that typifies the possibilities from letting this matter go unconsidered.

Mr. Lovejoy again testified, as appears on page 81 of the hearings, referring to the proposal for the treatment of these boys in military camps:

Only this, that unless the optional treatment meant the option to stay or go, to stay inside, or go outside, I should be very much opposed to it.

He says he would not object if they were privileged to move on if they wanted to, and that is taken care of in the measure I have proposed. He says he would be opposed to putting them under duress in a camp, and I would equally be opposed to that.

General Glassford, who formerly was superintendent of police in the District of Columbia, testified before the committee, and his testimony appears on page 126. He said:

The more venturesome and the more ambitious take to the road. Those without ambition, content to remain in their communities unemployed, idle, and hanging around street corners and pool rooms, and picking up a little food here and there, with occasionally a few hours of employment, are not in any way comparable with the young men who are traveling the road to-day.

Mr. President, that is another bit of evidence that the cream of these boys are the ones who are tramping the highways and not the ones who are remaining about the cities in pool rooms and making themselves generally loafers. General Glassford testified further:

It is because of the pressure of harsh economic conditions. Many of them come from families that are destitute; they are existing on charity. They have brothers and sisters younger than themselves who are underfed, and they believe by going out they could find employment somewhere in order to relieve the situation at home.

Mr. President, there is no plan that can be adopted, in my judgment, that will drive these boys back home to continue under the present economic conditions. It has been testified before the same subcommittee of the Committee on Manufactures that what we ought to do is to send these boys back home. To send them back home would mean further to humiliate them by requiring them to live in homes that are already supported by charity, to see the food taken out of the mouths of their younger brothers and sisters so as to maintain them. No decent, self-respecting boy would stay at home under those conditions.

Mr. President, we have facilities all ready, the personnel, and clothing to the extent of millions of pairs of shoes, millions of pairs of socks, and all other facilities ready to provide for the needs of these boys, but we sit indifferently by and store these facilities in warehouses while the boys tramp the highways.

General Glassford further testified:

The communities that I visited are doing very little. The various cities, those of 25,000 inhabitants and over, have missions or municipal lodging houses where the transients are given a night's lodging and one or two meals, and then required to move on. The most constructive measures that I have observed were in Florida.

He went on then to describe a camp at Jacksonville, where they take care of 302 transients; and, from the testimony, it seems that that is a very worth-while thing. But the appropriation for which I am pleading would in no way interfere with such projects.

General Glassford further testified, as appears on page 129, that if funds were appropriated they could be utilized to send boys home. The very contention I make is that these boys will not go back home, and properly should not go back home, and help to augment the difficulties their families are already encountering because of the economic conditions.

The Department of Labor issued a memorandum entitled "The Transient Boy." I do not want to encumber the RECORD with an unnecessary repetition of the reasons why these boys should be taken care of, but I am going to quote from a few of the comments in this memorandum. I doubt

whether it is worth while having it all printed in the RECORD.

These facts were assembled in the spring of 1932, and the information the Children's Bureau asks for was:

1. How many boys are leaving their homes, wandering into the communities and other States and becoming stranded there?
2. To what parts of the country are these boys going in largest numbers?
3. What are local communities doing, or planning to do, where the migration is of such proportions as to constitute a genuine problem?
4. Are local resources adequate to take care of this nonresident boy problem?
5. What is actually happening to these boys on their wanderings?

In the same report there is a paragraph headed, "Boys under 21 years of age on the road." Under a subheading there is the statement:

Numbers riding the freight trains.

In autumn, winter, and spring the migratory army of men and boys flows toward Florida, the Gulf States, the Southwest, and California. From first-hand observers, from local police, and from special agents and other employees of the railroads come estimates that seem to indicate a problem entirely beyond the knowledge of most of the country's social workers.

Mr. President, if it was beyond the knowledge of the country in the spring of 1932, it certainly should not be beyond the knowledge of the country in the rigid winter of 1933.

Under another subparagraph, the same memorandum states:

The men in charge of plant-quarantine stations on the principal highways entering California made some actual sample counts of hitch-hiking boys under 21 entering that State during April and May. The number averaged about 150 per week at each of three points.

To indicate the fact that it is a national problem, under a subheading in the same memorandum this is stated:

From practically every State in the Union boys fare forth to join the aimless army. The Community Boys' Lodge in Los Angeles reported the place of residence of 623 boys who applied for shelter there in the five months ended March 31. Forty-five States and the District of Columbia had contributed to this group.

New York stood first in a community 3,000 miles away from New York. Illinois stood next; Pennsylvania third; Texas fourth, with 38; then Oklahoma, with 35; Michigan, with 34; Ohio, with 28; Missouri, with 26.

And so on down the list. Of the 1,529 boys served by the Volunteers of America in Phoenix more than 50 apiece came from Texas, California, Oklahoma, Illinois, Missouri, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Colorado, and Michigan. Twelve additional States have contributed from 25 to 50 boys each.

Under a subhead entitled "Types," referring to the types that had been discovered as tramping the country in search of work, there appears this statement:

There is much testimony to the effect that these boys came from substantial American families. A study of 5,438 young men and boys served by the Salvation Army in Atlanta, Ga., during four winter months shows that 194 had been in college and 1,641 had attended high school.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|----------|----------------|---------------|
| Ashurst | Cutting | Kendrick | Schuyler |
| Austin | Dale | Keyes | Sheppard |
| Bailey | Davis | King | Shipstead |
| Bankhead | Dill | La Follette | Shortridge |
| Barkley | Fess | Lewis | Smith |
| Bingham | Fletcher | Logan | Smoot |
| Black | Frazier | McKellar | Steiwer |
| Blaine | George | McNary | Stephens |
| Borah | Glass | Moses | Swanson |
| Bratton | Glenn | Neely | Thomas, Idaho |
| Brookhart | Gore | Norbeck | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bulkeley | Grammer | Norris | Trammell |
| Bulow | Hale | Nye | Tydings |
| Byrnes | Harrison | Oddie | Vandenberg |
| Capper | Hastings | Pittman | Wagner |
| Caraway | Hatfield | Reed | Walsh, Mass. |
| Clark | Hayden | Reynolds | Walsh, Mont. |
| Connally | Hebert | Robinson, Ark. | Watson |
| Coolidge | Hull | Robinson, Ind. | White |
| Costigan | Johnson | Russell | |
| Couzens | Kean | Schall | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 597) to provide appropriations to carry into effect the act entitled "An act to authorize the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress," approved February 8, 1933, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 698. An act authorizing the President to transfer and appoint Lieut. (Junior Grade) Arnold R. Kline, United States Navy, to the grade of assistant paymaster with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps, United States Navy;

H. R. 1225. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Campus Martius Memorial Museum, of the city of Marietta, Ohio, the silver service presented to the United States for the gunboat *Marietta*;

H. R. 2065. An act for the relief of the Great Western Coal Mines Co.;

H. R. 5786. An act for the relief of Essie Finger;

H. R. 6637. An act authorizing the President to present a medal of honor to Richmond Pearson Hobson;

H. R. 7385. An act for the relief of Sidney Joseph Kent;

H. R. 9636. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to permit railroad and electric-car companies to provide mail transportation by motor vehicle in lieu of service by train;

H. R. 9714. An act for the relief of Marion F. Blackwell;

H. R. 11930. An act to provide a preliminary examination of the Green River, Wash., with a view to the control of its floods;

H. R. 12329. An act to establish the boundary lines of the Chippewa Indian territory in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 13372. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Pee Dee River and a bridge across the Waccamaw River, both at or near Georgetown, S. C.;

H. R. 13523. An act in reference to land in the Bonnet Carre floodway area;

H. R. 13535. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.;

H. R. 13743. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Illinois and Mississippi Canal near Tiskilwa, Ill.;

H. R. 13744. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Illinois and Mississippi Canal near Langley, Ill.;

H. R. 13770. An act to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the act of May 3, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 484); and

H. R. 13852. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Rock River, south of Moline, Ill.

DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED COTTON

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I make an explanation in reference to the joint resolution that has just come from the House appropriating money for carrying into effect the Red Cross cotton legislation which we passed several days ago? A few days ago we passed substantially the same provision or exactly the same provision in the Agriculture Department appropriation bill, but it is not known when that bill will be finally approved. The Red Cross is very anxious to start this work immediately. I am wondering if I may not ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution to carry that provision into effect?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the joint resolution be read for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 597) to provide appropriations to carry into effect the act entitled "An act to authorize the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress," approved February 8, 1933, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That to enable the Federal Farm Board to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress," approved February 8, 1933, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$4,100,000: Provided, That in addition to the purposes for which an appropriation was made by Public Resolution 43 of the Seventy-second Congress, approved July 22, 1932, for carrying out the provisions of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat and cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress," approved July 5, 1932, any balance, or so much thereof as may be necessary, now or hereafter existing in such appropriation is hereby made available to enable the Federal Farm Board to carry into effect the provisions of such act of February 8, 1933: Provided further, That the unexpended balance, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the appropriation under Public Resolution 43 of the Seventy-second Congress, approved July 22, 1932, shall be transferred in such amounts from time to time as may be requested by the Federal Farm Board to the appropriation herein made for the purposes of such act of February 8, 1933.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have submitted the matter to the Parliamentarian who prepared the provision contained in the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, and I am informed by him that it is precisely the same. I hope it may be passed to expedite the matter.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like an explanation of the character of the measure before us.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is the same provision that was adopted as an amendment to the Agricultural Department appropriation bill on last Friday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like a little further explanation of the matter.

Mr. SMITH. When the conferees met it was ascertained that there was an amount approximating \$11,000,000 that had to be provided to meet the obligations incurred in connection with the cotton in question. The market price amounted to about \$8,000,000 and the overhead to about \$2,000,000. It was ascertained that there was about \$4,000,000 still unexpended of the previous appropriation made in the allotment of the cotton to the Red Cross. That had not been carried into or reported as a part of the revolving capital of the Farm Board. An agreement was reached that the \$4,000,000 which they had left over from the previous transaction should be used by the Farm Board in liquidating this expenditure. The Farm Board then agreed that they would take \$2,500,000, which was the overhead, and assume that out of their revolving fund. That made \$6,500,000 that was taken out of the fund of the Farm Board directly and indirectly, leaving a balance of \$4,000,000 required to liquidate the transaction. That is the situation. Instead of the Government making an appropriation of \$11,000,000 to liquidate—the total amount was \$11,500,000—the Farm Board assumed \$6,500,000 and the Government \$4,000,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am not sure that I follow the Senator and understand all the implications of the pending measure. When the bill came from the House providing that 350,000 bales of cotton should be turned over to the Red Cross for proper distribution to the aid of the needy, it called for the Federal Government to assume all the obligations incident to the discharge of the existing liens against the cotton and the future charges against it. The Senate refused to accept that view and adopted an amendment, under the terms of which the Farm Board was to pay the entire charges against the cotton. That went to conference, but the conferees struck out the Senate amendment and

accepted the position of the House. When the report was submitted it was adopted. A motion was subsequently entered, in due time, for a reconsideration; and when the motion for reconsideration was brought to the floor, it was agreed that the bill should go to conference again and conferees were appointed by the House and by the Senate.

The conferees reported the second time, and I understood—I was not present when the matter was brought up in the Senate—that under the terms of the amended bill agreed to by the conferees, approximately \$4,000,000 only were to be paid by the Government of the United States, and the residue, amounting to about \$7,000,000, was to be paid out of the \$28,000,000 to the credit of the Farm Board in the Treasury of the United States, which \$28,000,000 constituted a part of the \$500,000,000 revolving fund.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator has stated exactly what I said—that there was unaccounted for of the \$28,000,000 the sum of \$4,000,000, left over unexpended in the previous transaction in connection with the 500,000 bales of cotton which, in 1931 or 1932, had been allocated to the Red Cross. There was an unexpended balance of \$4,000,000 which ultimately would have been at the disposal of the Farm Board. Now, they take that \$4,000,000 and assume the overhead, which is \$2,500,000, making \$6,500,000 that comes out of the funds of the Farm Board, the Government only to appropriate \$4,000,000. That is all.

Mr. McKELLAR. The amount is \$4,100,000, and that authorization has already—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. That authorization has already been agreed to, and this measure provides for carrying it out.

Mr. SMITH. That is all.

Mr. McKELLAR. And the appropriation was provided day before yesterday on the agricultural bill, but the House has passed this separate joint resolution.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. If this joint resolution shall be passed by the Senate, then, of course, the conferees will strike the provision out of the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, that will be done. I really think the joint resolution ought to be passed, and I hope the Senator from Utah may see his way clear to let it pass.

Mr. SMITH. It was the best we could do.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it was the best we could do.

Mr. KING. In view of the rather labyrinthine, not to say serpentine, course which this matter has pursued and the obligations which have arisen and the misinformation which has been sent out from Washington all over the country as to the effect of this measure, I am not disposed to hold up the matter; but I do feel, Mr. President, that it is very unfair and very unjust to take \$4,100,000 out of, to use an Irishism, the empty Treasury of the United States in order to pay debts—for that is what it amounts to—of the Farm Board. The Farm Board has incurred obligations in connection with this cotton—that is, the Farm Board and its subsidiary, the Stabilization Cotton Corporation—of approximately \$11,000,000, as stated by the able Senator from South Carolina. Now the Treasury of the United States is asked to appropriate \$4,100,000 to help liquidate those charges which have been incurred in the purchase of the cotton, its storage, insurance, and so on. But, as stated, Mr. President, I am inclined to think the Senate conferees have done the best they could, and without complimenting them too highly upon the job which they have done, I shall not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be considered as having—

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a moment. I ask that the joint resolution be laid aside temporarily.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What is the suggestion of the Senator from Utah?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah asks that the joint resolution be passed over temporarily. The Chair understands he wants to inquire into it further.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I hope we may dispose of it right away.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we should do that.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask that the joint resolution go over temporarily. I am not in any mood to make any objection, but I want to ascertain if an amendment may not be offered here that will not interfere with the measure at all. I should like to have an opportunity to look into it, and all I ask is that it be laid aside temporarily.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I was just going to observe, as chairman of the conference committee, that a few days ago we brought in the measure providing for the distribution of cotton the second time in the form in which it was finally passed, with the idea that we would provide the necessary appropriation at the first opportunity. I sincerely hope the Senator from Utah may collect himself and decide what he wants to do with it right away or very shortly.

Mr. SMOOT. I am going to send for the papers which the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] said he wanted me to look over. I have no desire to interfere with the passage of the joint resolution, but I do want at least to see whether the suggestion made by the Senator from New York can be added to the joint resolution without interfering with its passage in any way, shape, or form. I am as much interested in this relief legislation as is the Senator from Tennessee or the Senator from South Carolina or the Senator from Arkansas; all I am asking is that it go over temporarily.

Mr. McNARY. May I suggest to the Senator from Utah that day before yesterday, when the agricultural appropriation bill passed, an amendment carrying this particular appropriation was offered by the Senator from Tennessee and adopted and is now in conference, the conferees having been appointed yesterday.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly aware of that, and in the meantime it is to pass the pending joint resolution.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The joint resolution merely provides an appropriation to carry out an existing authorization.

Mr. McNARY. That is all.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is all it does.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Any modification of the authorization would be subject to a point of order and cause delay, and I respectfully suggest that we ought to pass this joint resolution providing the appropriation to carry out the authorization. Then, if the Senator wants to offer a new resolution, let him do so, but we have had already enough delay, it seems to me, in regard to this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Utah, if he will permit me, that I shall be glad to join him in his purpose. I know what it is; I think it is very wise, and I have no objection to it; but I do not think the amendment he has in mind ought to go on this joint resolution, and I do not believe it can be attached to it, as I think it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. That may be; I do not know as to that; but all I want is that the joint resolution go over temporarily. I repeat, I have no desire to defeat it; it can be passed to-day, but I do feel that I should have an opportunity to comply with the request of the Senator from New York to look into it. That is what I ask, and I have no intention whatever to prevent the passage of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah objects to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. HALE. I hope the Senator from Utah will decide as soon as possible whether he is going to ask to have the joint resolution referred to the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I have already stated my purpose to the Senator.

Mr. HALE. Haste is imperatively necessary in getting this joint resolution through; otherwise the House would have waited for action on the agricultural appropriation bill. If the Senator can make up his mind on this matter, and we can get the resolution agreed to within an hour or so, it will do a great deal of immediate good.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator—

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, this debate can not continue in my time. I feel I have been yielding now for 20 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan decline to yield further?

Mr. COUZENS. I do not see why the discussion on the matter should be continued indefinitely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield further.

Mr. SMOOT subsequently said: Mr. President, I find that the amendment suggested by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] is not included in this joint resolution, and therefore I have no objection to its passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I raise the question of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for that purpose?

Mr. COUZENS. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|----------|----------------|---------------|
| Ashurst | Cutting | Kendrick | Schuyler |
| Austin | Dale | Keyes | Sheppard |
| Bailey | Davis | King | Shipstead |
| Bankhead | Dill | La Follette | Shortridge |
| Barkley | Fess | Lewis | Smith |
| Bingham | Fletcher | Logan | Smoot |
| Black | Frazier | McKellar | Steiwer |
| Blaine | George | McNary | Stephens |
| Borah | Glass | Moses | Swanson |
| Bratton | Glenn | Neely | Thomas, Idaho |
| Brookhart | Gore | Norbeck | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bulkeley | Grammer | Norris | Trammell |
| Bulow | Hale | Nye | Tydings |
| Byrnes | Harrison | Oddie | Vandenberg |
| Capper | Hastings | Pittman | Wagner |
| Caraway | Hatfield | Reed | Walsh, Mass. |
| Clark | Hayden | Reynolds | Walsh, Mont. |
| Connally | Hebert | Robinson, Ark. | Watson |
| Coolidge | Hull | Robinson, Ind. | White |
| Costigan | Johnson | Russell | |
| Couzens | Kean | Schall | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

(After the conclusion of the speech of Mr. COUZENS.)

C. N. HILDRETH, JR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives and calls it to the attention of the Senator from Florida. The title of the bill will be stated.

The bill (H. R. 11461) for the relief of C. N. Hildreth, jr., was read twice by its title.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the Senate day before yesterday passed practically an identical bill, and I ask unanimous consent to consider and act on the House bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 11461) for the relief of C. N. Hildreth, jr., was read, considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the accounts of C. N. Hildreth, jr., former collector of customs for collection

district No. 18, with the sum of \$89.10, representing the amount of a payment made to the A. A. A. Garage of Miami, Fla., on voucher 851 in his August, 1928, accounts, and heretofore disallowed by the Comptroller General.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it shall take a recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14199) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think this session has brought to light one serious matter in relation to the Congress making appropriations. We have 12 appropriation bills, and we consider each subject matter unto itself without taking into consideration the relationship between the total amount appropriated for a particular activity and the total appropriations for all activities. When we are considering the War Department or the Navy Department appropriations or the Veterans' Bureau, or what not, we talk of the sum of money which is to be appropriated for the single purpose and consider that sum of money without considering its relationship to the total appropriations. We do not consider what part of our money goes for the Army or the Navy or for any other particular purpose. We simply put down what ought to be used to regulate or run or operate a particular department or bureau without regard to the national picture as a whole.

Nothing could more clearly illustrate this than the amendment which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] proposes to offer to the pending War Department appropriation bill. In that amendment he proposes to take care of about 80,000 or 90,000 boys from 14 years to 21 years of age. To take care of those boys would require, roughly, about \$85 apiece per annum. In other words, it would require \$8,500,000 to provide for facilities to take care of 100,000 boys in an Army camp for a year. We do not feel that we have the money to do that. We say we can not afford such an expenditure, but that economy should be effected in the conduct of the National Government. But, Mr. President, in another bill entirely we have appropriated just that sum of money for another purpose. The sum of \$8,440,000 has been appropriated for prohibition enforcement.

I know there are many here who feel that that appropriation is necessary. I know there are conscientious men who will support the \$8,440,000 for prohibition enforcement. But if we must decide between the two propositions, whether we are going to take care of these 100,000 boys on the one hand, or have the prohibition agents on the other hand, by the elimination of which of these will the national moral fabric be done the greater harm? I submit that the national moral fabric of America will be improved if we take the \$8,500,000 now proposed to be appropriated for prohibition enforcement and give it for the use of the 100,000 youths of the Nation, who now are roaming the roads and highways of the United States.

If there is anything in relativity, if we are looking after the morals of the young men of the country, is it not better to take the man with no home, who is sleeping in a box car, consorting on occasion with criminals as the testimony shows, while he is in his tender years, and place him under some wholesome influences, than it is to take that money and employ 3,000 or 4,000 prohibition agents to police a country of 120,000,000 people, a country 3,000 miles from east to west and practically 2,000 miles from north to south?

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator underestimate the cost of taking care of the 80,000 young men or boys to whom he refers? I recall that in the appropriation for the Indian

Bureau a few days ago it was disclosed that it costs \$425 to take care of each little Indian child in boarding schools where the buildings have already been constructed. That is merely for the food and clothing.

Mr. TYDINGS. While the Senator from Utah was absent the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] together produced figures, one from the War Department and the other from investigators, as to what it would cost to take care of 100,000 men in this manner. Those figures were purely an estimate, but they ran to a little less than \$100 a year.

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

Mr. REED. For food alone it would run to \$73 a year, and for clothing more than that, counting nothing for housing, nothing for medicine, nothing for transportation, nothing for the service of the officers who will be required. We could not possibly do it.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator, of course, wants the amendment defeated, and I do not blame him for taking a pessimistic view; but, by his own statement, made a few moments ago, he said that nothing would be needed for housing. He read the number who could be taken care of without any additional facilities. Why does he want to put that item in the equation now, when the figure I am using is the figure which he, himself, used but an hour ago?

Mr. REED. If these young men were put into tent camps, using all the tents the Army has, the Senator would surely expect those tents to be replaced? They will not last more than about a year.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not so much worried about the tents being worn out in a year, and I do not think the Senator is. I lived in a tent for a considerable period during my own life—for almost three years—and I think the life of a tent is considerably more than one year, and I believe the Senator thinks so, too. So that when the housing and other costs are dragged into this picture, I do not think they are fair items to be charged up in the cost of operating this service. But whether they are or not, I want to go back to the original proposition that it is more in the interest of humanity, more in the interest of morals, more in the interest of patriotism, more in the interest of economy, more in the interest of the future of this Nation to take that sum of money—\$8,440,000 which is now appropriated to pay prohibition agents—and to spend it upon these 80,000 or 100,000 boys than it is not to spend it on those boys and to apply it to prohibition agents with salaries of \$2,000, \$3,000, and even \$4,000 a year. I do not think any man in his right mind, be he "wet" or "dry," prohibitionist or antiprohibitionist, if he had the choice to make between those two purposes, namely, the use of this money for prohibition agents, on the one hand, or its use to take care of a hundred thousand boys from the ages of 14 to 21, on the other, would hesitate a moment to appropriate that sum of money for the care of the youth of this country. I say it is little short of a legislative crime to take nearly \$9,000,000 and hand it out for prohibition enforcement and not to spend it for the care of these youngsters who have no homes, who have no food, and who are frequently subjected to conditions and circumstances which can do nothing but hinder or prevent that wholesome development which more kindly events and circumstances would permit.

How can we get at this matter? As I said in the beginning, under our system there is no relativity in the consideration of appropriations. We have before us one appropriation bill at a time; now it is the Army bill; we can not transfer an appropriation from the independent offices bill to the Army bill, because it must come up separately; so that the question of merit as between these two items, as a parliamentary proposition, is not susceptible of solution in the way ordinarily to be taken to accomplish the desired result. But, Mr. President, I am hoping that we can accomplish the result I have in mind by adding just that sum of money to this amendment if it shall be adopted, namely, that we appropriate \$8,440,000 to take care of these boys

who are without any homes and that we take that sum of money from the prohibition enforcement appropriation. When the bill carrying that item shall come before the Senate—

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. In just a moment I shall yield to the Senator from Iowa—I shall offer an amendment to strike out the prohibition-enforcement appropriation, if we shall adopt the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, so that in the end the appropriation necessary to take care of these boys will not have cost the Government a single solitary red cent. We shall simply take it from something where it is now, in my judgment, being wasted, anyway, and apply it to where it will yield golden dividends in the rehabilitation of 100,000 boys who are without homes and without support in this emergency.

Now I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. Some time ago the Senator pointed out that there were a good many million bootleggers in this country. Will not his scheme turn those bootleggers out among the unemployed?

Mr. TYDINGS. If it would turn them out into Iowa, I think, in some respects, it would help the general level in logic. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, suppose all the American people could be assembled in this Chamber; suppose the proposition could be debated, and suppose finally it could be put to a ye-and-nay vote, namely, shall we spend this \$8,440,000 to pay three or four thousand prohibition agents or shall we spend it to provide care and training and food and housing for 100,000 boys from the ages of 15 to 21? What would the answer be? I may be perhaps over enthusiastic, but I believe that the response would come back, "Spend it on humanity; spend it to take these boys off the road, out of the stockyards, off the railroad trains; spend it to house them and feed them and train them; they are in their impressionistic years; they are in the years when they are laying the foundation for all their manhood; give to them the chance to be good citizens and let the men who are enforcing prohibition do without that sum of money." If that would be the attitude of the American people, let me inquire in whose interest are we here if not in the interest of our country, looked at as a whole? I would not be afraid to go to Kansas or to Iowa or to any other State in the Union, if it were physically possible, and submit that question to the men and women of the various States. In my judgment, the answer would be like a tidal wave in its magnitude; the answer would be, "We doubt very much, anyway, that any good comes from the so-called enforcement of prohibition, on the one hand; but, even conceding that there does come good, let us take care of these boys from 15 to 21, if it costs no more money than is now being expended on prohibition-enforcement agents? I dislike to inject the wet-and-dry question into this very meritorious matter.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland what amount of money would the Treasury have to appropriate for the maintenance and upkeep of the hundreds of thousands of people who would annually find their respective ways into these camps?

Mr. TYDINGS. May I say to the Senator from North Carolina it was roughly estimated—and, of course, it was only an estimate; there could be no accurate figures—that, with the housing now available at the Army posts, with the tents we have now available, about 88,000 persons could be cared for by the Government. It was also estimated that the cost of keeping them for a year, without equipment, such as rifles, and so on, would be somewhere around a hundred dollars a year.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED. We might as well be accurate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; let us be accurate.

Mr. REED. The estimate for subsistence alone is \$73 a year; the estimate for clothing is \$116 a year more—

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, Mr. President, does the Senator mean to say that one of these boys during a single year would require \$116 worth of clothing, bought at wholesale?

Mr. REED. That is what the estimate says, if the boy is to be clothed. The estimate for medical attention is \$18 a year; the estimate for transportation is \$6 a year; the estimate of the cost of the officers necessary to take care of them is \$84 a year; and the estimate, which the Senator disputes, for barracks and quarters, which includes the operating cost of the barracks—the heating of them, and that sort of thing, for, presumably, those in the North would have to be heated—averages \$68 per man per year, representing a total of about a dollar per day per man. It was brought out by the Senator from Utah that we are spending about one-third more than that in taking care of the Indian children who are our wards out in the West, but, presumably, these young men would not be cared for at so much expense as we are under in taking care of the Indian children.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, first of all the Senator says "clothing and equipment." He did not stress the word "equipment" very heavily, because the Senator knows that the soldier's equipment costs more than the soldier's clothing. First of all, he has to have a rifle; he has to have a cartridge belt—

Mr. REED. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield in a moment—he has to have a first-aid case; he has to have a canteen; he has to have a mess kit; he has to have a knapsack.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator himself has been a soldier and he knows that rifles are not included in the quartermaster's item of clothing and equipage. The Senator knows that rifles come from the Ordnance Department, which is a totally different branch, and in the estimate there is no allowance whatsoever for such equipment.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is drawing a distinction which his own memorandum does not show. It does not show that part of the estimated cost is from the Ordnance Department and a part from the Quartermaster's Department.

Mr. REED. There is not anything included from the Ordnance Department.

Mr. TYDINGS. How does the Senator know that?

Mr. REED. Because the item of clothing and equipage has been carried in the Army appropriation for probably a hundred years, and includes only quartermaster stores.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think I can draw the difference between the opinion of the Senator from Pennsylvania and that of myself to a head by this observation, that, speaking from a commercial standpoint, I myself would love to have the contract to furnish boys from 15 to 21 years old clothing at \$116 apiece a year, and I doubt if there is any man in this Chamber who would not like to have such a contract.

Mr. President, it is easy to furnish these young men clothing at a figure away below the amount estimated in this memorandum, which is \$116 a year, when suits of clothes may be purchased by the Army at from \$8 to \$10 and shoes at \$2.60 a pair. How many suits will a boy want at that figure?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. REED. I did not prepare these figures, and the Senator need not "shake his glory locks" at me, because I am not to blame for them. This is the estimate of the Army, and includes not only outer clothing but under clothing; it includes mess kits and knives and forks and blankets and pillows, and heaven knows what all. When the Senator takes the contract of which he is speaking he will be astonished to find how many things, such as blankets and pillows and cots and articles of that sort, that he had not counted on will be included, and he will not make so much money.

Mr. TYDINGS. We have already on hand a year's supply of blankets for a million men, and certainly we could use those without buying any new ones. We have also a year's supply of shoes for a million men, and we certainly could use those to the extent of a hundred thousand.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator would be the last Senator in this Chamber to advocate doing away with our reserve stock which we are keeping for the Army, and which we will have to have in the next war.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is right.

Mr. REED. Certainly, if we devote that reserve stock to this asylum performance, as suggested by the amendment, we will have to replace it, and it will cost just as much as if we bought it for these young men originally.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, Mr. President, I am of the opinion that it would be better to impair to a slight degree the reserve stock of a million men in times like these than it would be to keep that reserve intact and leave 12,000,000 people unprovided for for months and months and months. After all, the greatest element of national defense is confidence in and love for one's country.

Unless people have some regard for their Government and their country, all the reserve uniforms and rifles will not be worth a continental. With 12,000,000 people out of work, with 5,000 bank failures, with over a million farms sold under mortgage foreclosure and for delinquent taxes, this appropriation bill comes before us and Senators insist on making practically a uniform year's appropriation for prohibition enforcement when we could use the same sum of money to take care of 100,000 youths or even 50,000 youths. I say that we are showing neither morality nor heart nor intelligence nor logic if we continue to appropriate this vast sum for prohibition enforcement while these hundreds of thousands of young men roam about this country.

I lay that down as a basic proposition, and I should be glad to make it in any church in this land, because I have the belief that the most sincere lover of national prohibition as a theory and a principle would recognize that were he or she forced to make a decision between the two, the decision would lie on the side of these young men. Most of these church people are mothers. It might be their boys that are concerned. It might be that this would represent the difference between making a good citizen and a bad one.

Mr. President, I should be reluctant to stand here and draw this parallel if these agents could go and stamp out all the liquor in America. If it could all be wiped off the face of the earth, I should be glad to see the hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated; but we have had 13 years of this effort. We have had national prohibition with us ever since 1920. It is now going in its fourteenth year, I believe; and we know that while there may be some small gain, there are big losses connected with the eighteenth amendment.

Therefore, when I seek by this motion to transfer that sum from prohibition enforcement so that it may be used to take care of these young men, I do it with absolute confidence that on the whole there will be just as good enforcement without this appropriation as there will be with it. On the other hand, the 100,000 young men or the 50,000 or 60,000 young men that that sum of money would care for will be better off by far if it is appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. President, at the appropriate time I shall move to recommit the bill, with instructions to report it at once with an appropriation of \$8,440,000 in line with the purposes of the Couzens amendment; and on a subsequent date, when the independent offices bill is before us, I shall make a motion to strike out the \$8,440,000 appropriated for prohibition enforcement; so that what we will have accomplished will be the transfer of an appropriation from one bill to the other, the canceling of the enforcement appropriation, and the making of an appropriation for the care of the young men referred to in the Couzens amendment.

Now, I want to revert just shortly, before yielding the floor, to the figures adduced by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED].

Barracks and quarters, \$68 a man.

Mr. President, I do not follow that logic. I believe that the men who made this estimate allowed lots of safety; that a factor of safety was used, because they would not want to be caught in the position of having underestimated the cost; and I think even the Senator from Pennsylvania will concede that perhaps that was done in this matter.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED. It is quite obvious, is it not, that in the North these barracks are going to have to be heated?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. REED. It is quite obvious that all over the country they are going to have to be cleaned.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is right.

Mr. REED. It is quite obvious that there is some expense involved in keeping house for these young men, just as there is in keeping house for anybody else.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Pennsylvania says the barracks will have to be cleaned. I am assuming that there will be enough discipline in these camps that the men who occupy them will be compelled to keep them clean. As for heating the camps, it strikes me that on many of our reservations, like Camp Meade, over in Maryland, the Edgewood Arsenal, or Fort Hoyle, over in Maryland, there are lots of pine woods owned by the Government and a great deal of brush growing up in those woods where these young men could be taken out and could cut, for the most part, all of their firewood.

Mr. REED. I should like to suggest to the Senator that the bill before us provides that the only thing that can be done with these young men is to give them healthful exercise, and I do not think scrubbing floors or peeling potatoes would be called healthful exercise. We would have to hire somebody to do that for them.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; but the Senator also recollects that there is a general provision in the bill that the Secretary of War shall prescribe what those healthful exercises happen to be; and I think both the Senator and myself remember what some of those prescriptions were in years gone by. I have no fear that these young men will not get the healthy exercise which we all want them to have. They will have to peel potatoes, of course. I do not see why they could not garden on a part of these reservations, why they could not raise a part of their food, at least their fresh vegetables. There is plenty of ground there. It strikes me that a great many of these boys have some knowledge of raising agricultural products, and certainly that would lower the cost of subsistence. It would not be \$116 a year for one man.

Mr. REED. Seriously, can the Senator imagine a lot of East Side boys on Governors Island running a successful garden?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I can, with a little training.

The Senator figures that clothing and equipment will cost \$116 a year. I am sure the Senator must concede that that is a tremendous outlay to clothe a boy 15 or 16 years old, particularly where he is dressed in a uniform that is made on the same pattern at wholesale. I have not the exact figures, but my recollection is that an Army coat and an Army blouse cost about \$6 for the two. A pair of shoes costs \$2.50. That is \$8.50. After providing underclothes and shirts you have practically given the boy clothing for normal days like spring, summer, and fall; and if you can do that for \$15 you would still have \$101 left over to take care of him in three months of the wintertime.

I do not concede for a minute that these men are going to wear dress uniforms. They will have no shakoes in their hats. This is plain, substantial clothing, which we hope will be sufficient. Ordinarily, I would not be so much inclined to support a proposition of this kind, and I may be wrong about it, but I simply want to renew this thought: If \$8,440,000 will permit 75,000 or 100,000 of these boys to be housed and trained when they are 15 to 21 years of age, it is

a lot better to spend the money there than it is to pay three or four thousand prohibition agents this \$8,440,000.

If anybody cares to take issue there, I can understand that he is more in favor of national prohibition, it seems to me, than of humanity in its broader aspects, because prohibition is not responding to national control.

Therefore I want to leave just this additional thought: Out of the first 3,000 prohibition agents who were hired by this Government, 872 of them—over 25 per cent—were discharged for discovered corruption. I think Colonel Woodcock has greatly improved that service. I think he is a fine, conscientious man, who has done his best as he sees it to enforce this law; but the result as far as drinking is concerned, as far as bootlegging and hijacking are concerned, as far as stills are concerned, still remains with us.

Senators, in a period of great national emergency I think it better to spend this money to take care of 100,000 boys of tender age than to spend it on the futile experiment of trying to force morality upon the people with the bayonet and the bullet in a disguised form.

ON THE PUBLISHED TERMS OF DEBTORS TO BE PROPOSED TO THE FOREIGN DEBTS

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I beseech the Senate to let me occupy a moment of its time upon a subject not expressed in this bill, but which has to-day become timely and appropriate in view of the public statements given us in the cables of this morning sent from the foreign countries who are included in the general definition of international debtors to the United States.

Mr. President, I have listened with a commanding interest to the discussion we have just heard upon the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS], and I have heard our distinguished friend the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee [Mr. REED], and my honorable comrade in arms from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] descant upon the relative figures touching the subject they are presenting.

Mr. President, may I be pardoned parenthetically here to offer a definition? These gentlemen, eminent as they are, indulge in the pastime, so often resorted to, of quoting statistics. I think I can define statistics when presented to the Senate. Statistics is something that to the Senate seldom stays and never sticks. [Laughter.] Therefore, I must depart from any allusion to it. I return to another form of statistics, that of an international character and relating to a subject which, as I feel, greatly impends upon us in this hour.

Mr. President, I see upon the floor the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. BORAH], one who has done a service entitling him to the credit he receives from his Nation; and I delight if I can have his attention while I present my thought for a moment.

We are told in the public press, and in a general form of public information, that there is to be held in the city of Washington at an early day an international conference. It is designated one, called as an economic conference. On this floor some time past I dared venture the prophesy to the Senate that it would discover that under the guise of an economic conference the true object was to force the adjustment of the international debts, either through some form of cancellation or some other form of reduction and concession.

Mr. President, while these views are before the country as generally expressed, and while it is understood that the delegates of the debtor countries are being selected to make one of those annual hegiras known as international conferences, and to do us the compliment of presenting their personalities for our admiration, and voicing expressions of their sublime philosophy for our inspiration and guidance, we read that it is cabled for four consecutive days—I mention the time merely that it may be seen that that to which I refer was not an accident or an error, but so oft repeated as indicating a conviction and a fixed purpose—it is published that two of the debtor nations announce that there will be, so far as they are concerned, no trading nor any concessions touching any trade privileges.

They come to this conference with a proposition complete, and, as the public-print cables this morning announce, they have instructed the distinguished ambassador of Britain to return to the United States and present for that country, eminent as it stands in international relations, the specific proposition they bring to their creditor. The other land announces that what they have previously presented is what they will continue to repeat.

These two eminent debtors, eminent in international affairs and in historic conference, practically tell the United States, "We say to you, Mr. Creditor, we come to this conference with our proposition shaped and molded. It is one to our advantage. We have, after much consideration and deliberation amidst our own officials, reduced our proposition to an exactness, and we are to present it to you to take it or to leave it." While one of these debtors insists—on what, through four different sources of its official officers it has repeated—that that which they have previously presented will be repeated and they will accept no qualification.

Mr. President, these eminent debtors of ours, however much we may feel kindly toward them in all senses of a friendly Nation, seem to discard the fact that we did not ask for the conference. It is they who imposed upon the present sitting distinguished President of the United States their wish, and, out of the accommodating spirit of our Nation, executed their will.

They now confront us with the audacious proposition, rarely paralleled in the relations of a debtor to his creditor, that, "We come to you with a proposition framed and shaped, to our advantage, and to let you know in the beginning, before we assemble, that there is to be neither concession nor qualification, and further to inform you that the conference, so far as it is called to be such, is to be on our part the presentation of that which we have already decided, concluded, fixed, and established. Whatever may be its effect upon you or your commerce is not in our consideration, Mr. United States. Whatever result it may have upon your people, and the way they will react to their representatives, we do not know, nor pause we to consider. We merely announce to the world that we are moving toward you with the assumption that we, as debtors, will dictate to the creditor, and are confident that in our dictation we bear the means by which we can enforce our will by visiting upon the United States some commercial aspect of disadvantage, or visit punishment on your people if our offer is declined."

Mr. President, I rise to say that if these constant reports, quotations from officials of the Governments, as reported by the reliable news agencies of our land and of their exchanges in Europe, be true, why should there be this conference? What justification can the United States now have for holding a conference, ostensibly economic in name, but now guided by the spirit of dealing with the debts of the debtors, if we are to be confronted with the statement that they who are the debtors and who come to the conference are prepared neither for concession by proposition from us nor offering one which they themselves could appropriately tender? If we are already prejudged, and the debtors have prepared to come to the United States with a flaming defiance, asserting to us that the propositions they have shaped and framed among their delegates shall be tendered as their ultimate, final, and sovereign ones, and that any attempt by us to qualify them is to be a transgression, sir—if that is the attitude, and we are to assemble those who prejudice us and, in their prejudices of the past, are to renew all their hostilities of mind and heart for the future—it is an error for us to go one step farther in the convoking of this conference.

Mr. President, it should be ascertained now whether these declarations on the part of these eminent representatives have been made as represented; and if it is their object to adhere to them, sirs; if such is true, let us not multiply these prejudices by another assemblage which may break out in some further flame of hatred. Better our foreign debtors remain in their homes, while we carry the presumption of kindness in their behalf, than to proceed to an unhappy

error in their international statesmanship as recorded in their expressions. We proclaim that if they come here with the purpose solely of hippodroming by number, or, sir, intimidating the United States by design of finance and force of tariffs into adopting whatever they propose, and do not give us the quarter of courtesy to hear our proposition where we have one, and withal announce their unwillingness to concede anything in any manner of a conference of friendship, better that we now declare the call, by whomsoever made, as void and at an end. Better, indeed, is it, not to repeat these farces which have been enacted in seven different places since the World War, but which have, when we, the United States, are involved, left us where we have either been made ridiculous before the world or the object of pity in the eyes of our own Nation and its people.

Rather than that such again be duplicated in its offensive attitude and its harsh reenactment it is far better that we remain as we stand, presenting, as we have before, our righteousness, based upon the law both of justice of the world and of humanity of mankind. It is here that we inform these debtors that if they can not come to us in the spirit of Holy Scripture, transcribing in its expression, "Come, let us reason one with another," then it is better that they not come at all.

Mr. President, I do not want to see another repetition of proceedings that awaken more hatred in the bosoms of European nationalities against the United States. I want to see no further drama which invite the citizens of the United States to carry with them a continuous suspicion and a judgment of enmity against those of foreign lands. I want to see no more or never again the constant conduct that has produced no result other than to incite fears on the part of our own Nation, that is being juggled with, to the object of a trickery that cheats a people of its debt and humiliates it of its honor.

I wish to see no more where the nationalities of Europe, long practiced in the art of delusion and deception in matters of statecraft and diplomacy, shall again try their ancient craft with success upon a trusting and indulgent people such as we have ever shown ourselves to be in every gathering that has ever been summoned looking to the reestablishment of a friendship or the fixity of a friendly commercial rivalry in trade and finance.

Therefore, Mr. President, I impose upon the time of the eminent chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and that of the Senators in charge of this pending bill, all advocating one aspect or the other of right and justice in our national defense. I beseech their attention to the fact that it is timely that we again consider the international threat boldly made as to the United States, and that before it reaches the point where it can be executed that from some place of authority in this Government the voice may go out that if such threat as expressed is to be the policy of those who shall attend the conference—that is, to yield nothing, to concede nothing, demand everything, and have it or to retire with what they feel a wound for having been refused, while they flaunt us before the world as again either being defeated in combat of intellect or made ridiculous in diplomacy—that we will have nothing to do with it.

Therefore, I rose, Mr. President, to call attention of my honorable colleagues to the position in which we were being placed at the hour by these publications being circulated in every court in Europe and in every civilized part of the world, all of which inditing upon the hearts of Americans and flashing upon the minds of statesmen that which already puts us before the conference to be assembled as having been discredited before we began and dishonored at the finish.

If these honorable nations which are invited shall assemble in the spirit of some mutual concession, they are welcome here, both in the courtesy that comes from an American heart and in the generosity of the American nature.

We seek only justice. We hope that the conference will do nothing more nor less. If it shall do the justice that is

sought by mankind, that we approve, for we delight to express here that we accept the expression of the great Cardinal Richelieu: "For justice all places a temple, all seasons summer."

I thank the Senate.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14199) making appropriations for the military and non-military activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, as the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] is before us I want to enter my protest against the consideration and adoption of it. I know that the principle involved may be one that is humanitarian, but I want to ask my colleagues, particularly those who come from the section of the country which I in part represent, what they would visualize if this should become the law? Every post would be flooded with young men between the ages specified. All sorts of affidavits and asseverations will be made that they are unemployed. Even those who are employed or who could find employment, as a matter of course, would select and elect to go to where the Government was furnishing them food and clothing and delightful training and recreation for a year.

Just visualize what effect that would have, not only in the South, where we have a very improvident race, but in every section of the country. It is an invitation to young men to accept by every conceivable device this proposal of the Government. There is no limit to the number that may go. Therefore none of us can say what would be the limit of the appropriations necessary under the provisions of the amendment in order to meet the condition which we ourselves create and which would practically bankrupt the Treasury if we persisted in it. The calculations which have been made here as to what it would cost per capita are interesting, but the principal consideration is, What would be the number that we would have to feed and clothe?

So far as the available labor supply in nearly every section of the country is concerned, it would be exhausted between the ages specified in the amendment. It is bad enough for us to have unemployment and to be making appropriations for those who have earnestly sought employment and could not find it. It is bad enough for us to have to meet that condition. We should meet it. But deliberately to introduce a measure that invites unemployment is beyond my comprehension. That is what the Senator's amendment proposes to do. The young men or boys must make affidavit that they have been unemployed for six months and we give them a year in which to do so, six months of which time they may idle around and then make application and the necessary affidavit.

Aside from that, the principle involved is disastrous to the youth of the country, no matter to what race they belong. In the very formative period of their character for us to invite them to take advantage of this proposal would be extremely disastrous.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. BROOKHART. I would like to ask the Senator if the way things are going now is not disastrous to the youth of the country?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I recognize that, and I want to beseech the Congress to address itself to remedying the principles which have brought about this condition rather than to indulge in certain legislation which intensifies the destruction of self-respect and a respect for the Government.

Mr. BROOKHART. I quite agree with that principle, but I want to ask the Senator another question. It will take some time for anybody's plan of relief to employ these boys and get them jobs. In the meantime should not something like this be done to take care of them?

Mr. SMITH. No, Mr. President. I really think that in the main we are prone to exaggerate the condition. But

suppose we do not. This plan would not relieve the condition that has brought about the present distressing situation, but would intensify it. If we are to invite the unemployed between the ages specified in the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to become the wards of the Government, we have instilled into them the idea and started the habit in their very youth of depending upon the Government for their support, for their food, clothing, and training. They and we ought to recognize that the Government is not instituted for the purpose of providing these things, but for the purpose of providing a means by which every man, woman, and child in the country shall have an opportunity to make a decent and comfortable living.

We all know what has brought about this condition and yet we have not the courage to meet it and solve it. We know why this financial restriction. We know why this deflation. Every man understands what the conditions were when we had an abundance of currency and easy credit, when everybody had a job, when from 1914 to 1919 the bank failures in the country decreased until 1919 there was not a bank failure in the United States. On May 20, 1920, by the exercise of the arbitrary power of our bankers and their allied interests, deflation was set about which gradually grew from bad to worse until to-day we are the victims of the crime of May, 1920.

We did not call an international conference to deflate. We did it with American bankers in the city of Washington. Then why should we be here asking for an international conference to rectify that wrong which American bankers did? Why do we stand here day after day and treat or attempt to treat the symptoms of a fundamental disease of a lack of adequate circulating medium? Here we are actually attempting to jeopardize the character of the youth of our country, causing them to look to a dole from their Government rather than creating a condition where they can look to their own efforts for an honorable living and setting aside enough for an honorable old age.

No, Mr. President; I am not going to vote for any more of these treatments of symptoms.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator from South Carolina very eloquently said a moment ago that the Government is not organized for the purpose of looking after these youths. I wonder under what conception the Senator believes the country is organized to relieve the cotton farmers?

Mr. SMITH. I am not asking the Government to relieve the cotton farmer. I am asking the Government to take the barriers away and let the cotton farmer relieve himself. That is what I am asking be done.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Considering the amendment of the Senator from Michigan as a military measure—that is, as a provision designed for the improvement and strengthening of the national defense—it seems to me to be almost wholly ineffective. It makes a boarding house, so to speak, of every Army post in the country, requires no service, provides no training for the young men who are presumed to be the beneficiaries of the provision. Therefore as a military measure it is ineffective.

Considered as a measure of destitution relief, it limits the alleged benefits to certain classes on the basis of arbitrary distinctions. First, there is an age limit between 17 and 24. Next, in order to get admission to an Army post under the provisions of the amendment the applicant must prove not only that he is unemployed but that he has been unemployed for at least six months.

I have a full appreciation of the motives and purposes of the very able Senator from Michigan, who offers the amendment, but I do not think it is to be approved either as a military measure or as a destitution relief measure.

Mr. SMITH. May I ask the Senator a question right there in my own time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH. For what character of young men are we providing their board and keep at the expense of the Government?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. There is no limit except as to age and period of unemployment.

Mr. SMITH. Does not the Senator know that these young men, and their name is legion, who would not accept a job if it was offered, who are idle and hitch-hiking on the public highways, infesting our cities, overrunning every highway and byway on the ground that the Government owes them a living, would constitute a part of this group?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I am assuming that there are many young men in the country who would like to have employment, but are unable to secure it, and that there is a considerable number who would actually be benefited by the operation of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan should the same be enacted into law. But I make the point, and reaffirm it, that to admit into the military posts any young man who happens to be between the ages of 17 and 21 and who has been out of employment for a period of six months, without any requirement or provision for training, with only the general arrangement that the Secretary of War shall be authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of the amendment, makes the provision ineffective for any military advantage.

Then, passing to the second phase of the matter, the limitations as to the beneficiaries are arbitrary, and perhaps necessarily so, because manifestly all of the idle can not be provided for at Army posts. Manifestly it is essential to make some limitations. It seems to me that the limitations made by the Senator from Michigan are not unreasonable. Nevertheless it is an inadequate arrangement for destitution relief. It will work harm rather than benefit to the military service, because, as suggested by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] in a question that he asked during the early period of the debate this morning, it is impossible to take a hundred thousand idle men in military posts with only a general requirement that they shall be subject to discipline and with no definite plan for the utilization of their services without threatening, if not breaking down, the morale of the men who are actually in the service and with whom they must come in contact.

I think the Congress must in the early future proceed to the consideration of a destitution relief measure. We passed one last session, and I think we must pass another in the very early future. In all probability it will be brought forward within a day or two. However good its intention is—and I concede it to be good, and I recognize that the Senator from Michigan has an active, quick mind and that he is always able to give logical and forceful reasons for any proposal he advances—I feel it my duty to say that I do not believe the arrangement proposed will prove a very effective destitution relief measure.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the fact that I gave notice of my intention to offer an amendment including vocational training so far as there may be practicable or available facilities, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] said that he would accept the amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me further?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I understood the Senator from Michigan to say this morning in answer—at least indirect answer—to a question I asked him, that, according to his estimate, about 88,000 young men should be provided for under this arrangement. A mere amendment to

the amendment of the Senator from Michigan providing for vocational training will not accomplish very much. Military posts have no facilities for that sort of training.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator is mistaken as to that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am not mistaken in the sense in which I am speaking. I recognize the fact that my statement may not be taken literally but certainly the Senator from Iowa will not contend that the facilities now provided by law at military posts are adequate for the vocational training of 88,000 additional men, that is, 88,000 men in addition to the number that are now at such military posts. If he makes that contention, I should like to hear him discuss the facts upon which he bases it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think I still have the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; and I thank the Senator from South Carolina for yielding to me.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me, just for a moment, to reply to the Senator from Arkansas?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Iowa for that purpose?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. I wish to call attention to the situation at Rock Island, Ill. Right now there is equipment there for the vocational training of fifteen or twenty thousand men, and it is standing idle.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have expressed myself in reference to this amendment. Just a word in indorsing what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] has said.

What will be the effect upon every Army post of having precipitated upon it this flood of young men who are not there for the purpose of military training, and who, if they were, entirely lack previous training and previous equipment along the lines of discipline? It would mean the total demoralization of discipline at every Army post; it would be converting our military posts into temporary boarding houses for all the idle youth from the age of 17 to 24. Who can determine what number would be there? Beside that, Mr. President, the principle involved is a wrong one.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMITH. I yield for a question.

Mr. WAGNER. I wish, if I can, merely to correct what I think, from a statement made by him, is a wrong impression on the part of the Senator from South Carolina as to the type of young men who are now wandering through the country and who are called "transients."

I understood the Senator to say that they are young people who do not care to work. As a matter of fact, they are not of the type which we used to designate as "hoboes" or "tramps." They are young men and young women, a very large number of them—it is said there are more than 50,000 young women in this category—who are wandering through the country, having left their own homes because during these depression days there is no opportunity for them to secure employment at home, and they are going out into the country in search of an opportunity for employment. As they arrive in other localities they are denied unemployment relief because of the restrictive measures which nearly all municipalities have now adopted, providing that one must be an actual resident of the community for a year or so before any employment will be given to him by relief agencies. So these young people, striving for an opportunity for employment, many of whom are educated, some of them being college graduates, are denied that opportunity, and their case becomes absolutely hopeless, unless, with the co-operation of the Federal Government, the State is able to deal with the particular problem.

Mr. SMITH. This amendment does not propose to provide employment.

Mr. WAGNER. I was not speaking in behalf of the proposed legislation. I simply heard the Senator from South Carolina say that these were young men who do not want to work. I wanted to assert, after having had the benefit of

listening to the testimony of witnesses who have made a thorough investigation of this whole subject, that these are young people who do want employment, and they are out in search of it but can not get it.

Mr. SMITH. I recognize, perhaps equally as well as does any Member of this body, the distressing condition of unemployment, but this amendment does not propose to provide employment. It does not seek to bring about a condition under which one may maintain his self-respect and, at least, make an effort, under provisions made by the Government, to sustain himself in some kind of employment. He is simply to be the guest of the Government at an Army post for a year without any cost, with food and clothing furnished him.

The Senator from New York indicates that there are an equal number of young ladies wandering over the country. If we should follow the modern fashion we would have co-educational institutions at the Army posts and let the boys and girls be there together. I think we might augment the number of unemployed if we would incorporate such a provision in this measure.

But, Mr. President, it seems to me we have selected the wrong place for housing and caring for the unemployed. The adoption of the proposal would demoralize our training camps and inject a flood of irresponsible individuals who in a manner would be put under the discipline of those who have charge of the camps without being required to do anything but to take a certain amount of exercise each day and to receive food and clothing.

Mr. President, there is not a Senator here but who can visualize what would be the result if this provision were enacted into law, particularly in the South. I am not so well acquainted with conditions that exist elsewhere as to the character of those who would take advantage of this opportunity, but I know what would happen in my section.

I am against the principle involved in this bill. I think if we would resolutely set our faces toward curing the disease that has brought these manifestations of distress we would not need to take care of the unemployed. There is plenty in America, and there should be the opportunity for every able-bodied man and woman to be employed and to enjoy its vast wealth. The difficulty is that the wealth is in the hands of a few, so that at a time when we have the greatest amount of wealth the Nation ever had, even our Government is failing to meet its expenses; States are defaulting on their bonds; municipalities and other political subdivisions are going bankrupt, banks are failing all over the country, fear and distress exist everywhere. Why? Because Congress has not the courage to do its duty under the Constitution, and we are subject to the sweet will of those who take advantage of our laws, hoard our money, and permit the country to become bankrupt and ruined.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that a few days ago I received a letter from a business man living in a little town in my State. In the letter he referred to the Government supplying food and clothing to the unemployed. He happens to live in a cotton-growing section of my State, where usually the farmers depend on colored labor for picking the cotton crop. He said that since the distribution of free food and clothing began last September it had been impossible for the farmers to prevail upon the colored laborers to engage in their customary pursuit of picking cotton, that they preferred to rely on Uncle Sam's bounty and favor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to offer and have considered an amendment which I understand the committee is willing to accept.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 48, line 18, after the word "States," it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That nothing in this provision shall be so construed as to prevent the application of funds herein contained to the pay and allowances or travel expenses of any officer or enlisted

man of the National Guard who may surrender said pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay for the period of his service in the National Guard.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I understand that this amendment is being considered by unanimous consent and does not interfere with the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has not as yet made his motion.

Mr. COUZENS. I wish to point out that I have not made the motion as yet.

Mr. REED. Very well; I am glad to be informed as to the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is in order, and the question is on agreeing to it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the only purpose of this amendment is to guard against a construction which might be given to the provision which was adopted by the House and retained by the Senate committee. It is simply designed to make it clear that that provision is not intended to apply to a National Guard officer or enlisted man, drawing disability pay or pension, who surrenders such disability pay or pension during the period of his service in the National Guard.

Mr. REED. My understanding is, Mr. President, that this amendment is in entire accord with the thought of the committee. We had supposed that it affected only those who are actually drawing compensation from the Government. If the amendment of the Senator will make it more clear, as I think it does, I interpose no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the amendment but merely to make a brief statement. I should not like to vote against the amendment without making the statement, because I think everyone must sympathize with the general purpose which the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] has in mind—to wit, some sort of care and relief for the very large number of young men who are traveling about the country at this time without employment.

It seems to me, however, that in the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and in the Costigan-La Follette bill, a much wiser and better provision is made for the same general purpose. Moreover, it is much broader, because, as I read both of those bills, provision is made for the transient unemployed wherever they may be found.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. WAGNER. There is another advantage in that dealing with the subject is delegated entirely to the States where the individuals are located.

Mr. GEORGE. I was going to come to that. It seems to me, also, to be a very distinct advantage over the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to leave to the States, as both the Costigan-La Follette bill and the Wagner bill do, the relief of the transient unemployed of all ages.

It seems to me to be rather dangerous to bring about unusual concentrations of young men between 17 and 24 years of age in the various military posts of the country, wholly aside from all of the other objections that have been pointed out. These unusual concentrations must make against the public health. They can not promote sanitary conditions, because these young men can not be placed under military restrictions in any proper sense. I therefore believe that the true principle would be the care of the unemployed transients not by concentration but by decentralization, leaving the problems to each of the States, and by making the necessary appropriation to meet the necessities of the present time.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BROOKHART. I should like to ask the Senator if there is not much more danger to the public health in the way they are concentrating now, without medical attention or anything else, than there would be if they were brought together in orderly fashion and under medical care in these military posts?

Mr. GEORGE. I should unhesitatingly say "No," because I think the Senator must realize what we may expect to find when an unusually large number of young men are brought together without very strict military discipline in the several military posts scattered throughout the country. It is bad enough as it is; and the purpose to relieve this situation is altogether laudable and commendable. If there were no other way of doing it, or, as I think, no better way, I think I should vote for the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan; but I think a better way is pointed out in both the Wagner and the Costigan-La Follette bills.

Mr. President, I merely wanted to make that statement before voting upon this amendment, because I should be unwilling to vote against it without a word of explanation.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, a few moments ago, when I was out of the Chamber, I understand that the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] offered an amendment to this bill which was accepted. I had an amendment to the same provision which takes care of a condition which the committee desires to take care of; and I should like to send that amendment to the desk and have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Alabama offers the following amendment:

On page 48, line 18, after the word "States," insert:

Provided further, That present adjutant generals who may be drawing such emoluments may be continued in a federally recognized status without pay under this act.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. REED. There are now four adjutant generals in the United States who were partially disabled through wounds received in action with the enemy. They are apparently entirely capable of performing their duties as adjutant generals. In case of war they would not be called upon for field service, but would remain in their home States. For that reason their cases are different from those of the officers of the National Guard generally, who would be called upon for field service.

The committee was asked to make an exception for these adjutant generals from this provision that is found on page 48, and our inclination was to do it; but we refrained from doing it because of the feeling that if we did it for the adjutant generals it would be unfair to the officers on their staffs and to the other members of their staffs, and that is the only reason they were not excepted entirely.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama changes the picture quite a little because of its provision that these adjutant generals may be federally recognized, but will cease to draw any pay from the Federal Government under this Army appropriation bill. For that reason, Mr. President, I know that I speak the sense of the committee when I say that I shall not interpose any objection.

Mr. COUZENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|----------|----------|-------------|
| Ashurst | Byrnes | Fletcher | Hull |
| Austin | Capper | Frazier | Johnson |
| Bailey | Caraway | George | Kean |
| Bankhead | Clark | Glass | Kendrick |
| Barkley | Connally | Glenn | Keyes |
| Bingham | Coolidge | Gore | King |
| Black | Costigan | Grammer | La Follette |
| Blaine | Couzens | Hale | Lewis |
| Borah | Cutting | Harrison | Logan |
| Bratton | Dale | Hastings | McKellar |
| Brookhart | Davis | Hatfield | McNary |
| Bulkley | Dill | Hayden | Moses |
| Bulow | Fess | Hebert | Neely |

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Norbeck | Robinson, Ind. | Smoot | Vandenberg |
| Norris | Russell | Steiwer | Wagner |
| Nye | Schall | Stephens | Walsh, Mass. |
| Oddie | Schuyler | Swanson | Walsh, Mont. |
| Pittman | Sheppard | Thomas, Idaho | Watson |
| Reed | Shipstead | Thomas, Okla. | White |
| Reynolds | Shortridge | Tammell | |
| Robinson, Ark. | Smith | Tydings | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK].

The amendment was agreed to.

ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NORBECK. Would it be in order for me to make a motion at this time to reconsider the vote by which a joint resolution passed the Senate day before yesterday? I would like to make the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator should enter a motion to reconsider and at the same time make a motion to request the House to return the joint resolution.

Mr. NORBECK. I enter that motion, and I move that the House be requested to return to the Senate joint resolution (H. J. Res. 533) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States and Alaska. If the motion is agreed to, I shall take no further action on the joint resolution in the absence of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], with whom I have an agreement that we might reconsider it. I merely want it restored to the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota moves to reconsider the action whereby the Senate passed House Joint Resolution 533 and requests the House to return the joint resolution to the Senate and restore it to the calendar. The question is on agreeing to the motion proposed by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, does the Senator object to the bill, or what is his object?

Mr. NORBECK. No; I do not object to the measure. I am heartily in favor of it. I had an amendment that I wanted to offer to it simply making it possible to keep better track of these mining claims and have them available for mining purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the motion submitted by the Senator from South Dakota that the House of Representatives be requested to return the joint resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14199) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a number of Senators have asked me my intention about continuing with the bill. I hope very much that we shall be able to pass it this afternoon. I believe that we can pass it before 5 o'clock. I should like to run along for a while in the effort to do that.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, there are a number of Senators who desire to be heard more or less briefly, some of whom are not here. I am here, but I should prefer that the matter should go over until Monday.

Mr. REED. Those Senators knew that the Senate would be in session to-day. I do not think they are entitled to go away and hold up the business of the Senate. The Senator from Michigan tells me that he has not quite finished his remarks; and therefore I will withhold my own brief remarks until he finishes.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina made a statement which I challenge, that is, that these boys are not willing to work.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I correct the Senator in that statement? I said a percentage of them were not willing to work; not all.

Mr. COUZENS. I venture to say that the Senator from South Carolina can not present any authentic information showing that a percentage are not willing to work.

Mr. SMITH. I may not be able to present information as to any great percentage, but the Senator from South Carolina is pretty thoroughly convinced that there is a percentage of the individuals to whom the Senator refers who are not willing to work. So far as that is concerned, even were there not, I think I gave satisfactory reasons why I thought this amendment should not be agreed to.

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator also referred to doles. I would welcome his analysis of the doles, which have amounted to nearly \$2,000,000,000, which have been passed out of the Treasury through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and doles which have gone to the cotton States by the hundreds of millions, which will never be repaid. If those are not doles, then I do not understand the meaning of the word.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator indicate just what appropriations that have gone to the South he considers doles, outside of the emergency fund which has just in the last few months been made available for the relief of unemployment?

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator admits that the one we just let go through by unanimous consent was a dole?

Mr. SMITH. I think the one we provided some time ago, amounting, I think, to \$300,000,000, to be allocated among the States at the request of the governors of the States, looking toward helping out unemployment, had at least an element in it, so far as it applied to my State, that was infinitely better than a straight dole, in that the people are employed in different kinds of work, sweeping up leaves on the lawns or cleaning out drains—at least making a gesture to earn the amount that is donated.

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator very properly calls it a gesture, but I want to submit that during my service here the Senator from South Carolina has made the most earnest pleas on this floor—most of which have been listened to and complied with—for relief of Southern States suffering from drought, floods, and one thing or another. If the appropriations we have made were not doles in the emergencies when they were made, then the appropriation I ask would not be a dole, because the present emergency is equal to those of the past.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that if they will refer to the history of the loans made to the drought and storm-stricken regions and to the sections where, on account of very low prices, the banks have failed, it will be found that in excess of 87 per cent of the money borrowed has been paid back by those who received it.

Mr. President, there is not a man in this body for whom I have a higher regard than I have for the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. COUZENS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. I have had no colleague here who has more earnestly cooperated with me in the efforts I have made to relieve the distress to which he has referred. But we must differentiate between such relief as is requested here and the furnishing of credit to those who can not otherwise get it, and who, employing that credit, have sustained their self-respect and paid back to the Government in excess of 87½ per cent of the actual amount borrowed plus the interest on it.

Mr. COUZENS. Of course, if the Senator reduces this whole problem to a question of gold, then he probably is accurate. If the Senator is unable to visualize any return under Government activity except gold, then he is undoubtedly right. But I have submitted evidence this morning, and I am going to submit some more, to the effect that there will be returns to this country which will be much greater and better than gold. Therefore I refuse to reduce this discussion to a mere balance sheet, to a mere calculation of the percentage of gold that will be returned to the country as a result of the Government's activities.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I heartily concur with him in that, but I do object to the manner in which he proposes, in this measure, to bring about what I think could be brought about in another way, a way which would enable the individuals to retain their self-respect, and also would not interfere with our Military Establishment.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, does the Senator recall the comments made by the Senator from Georgia with respect to the Wagner bill and the Cutting bill, both of which I favor? Does he recall that the money is to be used for feeding and housing, and for exactly the same purpose in my amendment? Does the Senator favor those measures?

Mr. SMITH. I think they would be an improvement over this suggestion, because it would leave the matter to the States. They would not concentrate the boys in our Military Establishment, and would leave some manner of discretion to those who administer the funds to take care of that precious element known as the self-respect of the individual.

Mr. COUZENS. I ask the Senator whether he contends that the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico to set up camps such as there are in California, and one in Georgia and one in Florida, with an appropriation of \$15,000,000, would tend to maintain the self-respect of the young men more than putting them in the Army?

Mr. SMITH. No, Mr. President; nor have I spoken in favor of it.

Mr. COUZENS. I ask the Senator whether he would be in favor of that.

Mr. SMITH. I think not.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from Michigan has indicated a great familiarity with the testimony taken by the subcommittee of the Committee on Manufactures, and he knows that it is replete with information from the persons who are most familiar with the types of men and boys, transients, who are now on the road. He knows, further, that almost without exception the witnesses testified to the fact that the largest percentage of these young men and boys, and the older men, too, for that matter, are traveling because they are seeking work. Many of the witnesses pointed out that it was the more enterprising, the more self-respecting, the more ambitious, who were on the road.

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator must have overlooked that I read all of that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wanted to direct the Senator's attention, in refutation of the statement made by the Senator from South Carolina, to the statement of Mr. Black, who is in charge of the California camps for transients in the forests, as it appears on page 4 of the hearings. I could not be present during all the time the Senator was speaking, and I do not know whether he read what Mr. Black said in response to the question of Senator CURTIN, "What do you find out about the character and general type of transients?" Did the Senator read the answer to that?

Mr. COUZENS. I did not.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It seems to me it would come in very appropriately following the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. COUZENS. At the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin, I will read the reply of Mr. Black to Senator CURTIN's question, as follows:

We found them just as good as you find a man in the daily walks of life. The men in camp were, for the most part, of the highest types in the ranks of the unemployed. They were recruited through various charitable relief agencies in the cities. Only volunteers were accepted in the camps, but after reaching camp each man was required to work or leave. As a matter of fact, I would say that it is a boys' paradise. Many of them were laborers, but there were also business men and tradesmen. There were many professional men and many high-school and college graduates. In one camp we had 18 college graduates and 33 high-school graduates, which is a very high percentage. We have graduates of some of the largest colleges in the United States. As I say, we have quite a number of small tradesmen and business men who have gone broke. We have had men who held fairly

responsible jobs as engineers, occasionally a doctor and a dentist. The occupations of the men are listed in this pamphlet which I shall be glad to leave with the committee. We have men who had been bankers and brokers. They listed themselves as clerks and after that they came in to get a job, many of them giving a false name, as a matter of pride.

From the standpoint of the men the program was most successful.

I think that covers the part relating to the character and type of men.

Mr. President, I submit that, whatever program is carried out, as provided in the proposal made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CURRING] it will take some considerable time. In other words, they will have to organize to set up these camps, which, I submit, will take some time, and whether I am quite correct about that I do not know, because I have not studied the bill of the Senator from New Mexico.

I am unable to see what there is so sacred about the Army. Just why would taking care of these 88,000 boys disrupt the Army? Certainly when we went to war, and the boys were wanted for the protection of our country, these camps and these facilities were readily available.

Mr. President, we are now at war with depression, we are now at war with need, and the facilities are in the same condition in which they were when we went to war in 1917. There was no complaint then about disorganizing the Army. There was no complaint about taking the youngsters in from 16 to 21. There was no complaint that they would disorganize the Army. But now, when we are in a fight against depression, in an effort to protect the flower of the country, we are confronted with the contention that it would disrupt the Army.

Mr. President, not even the War Department, in the reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania, indicated that it would disrupt the Army. The letter of the Secretary of War was, in my judgment, a fair statement of the facts. He did not say one word about disrupting the Army.

Not only that but I am advised that only to-day one of the admirals of the Navy, being called on the telephone in an effort to get his influence against this proposal, said that the Navy would be glad to take care of 15,000 of these boys.

Mr. President, if it should eventuate that I can not succeed in having this proposal put on the Army appropriation bill I will revise it to include both the Army and the Navy and present it as an amendment to the Navy appropriation bill, and I will continue to offer it to every appropriation bill for the remainder of the session, because it is not my intention, from false pride about the Army, to stand by and neglect 88,000 boys who could be taken care of under the provisions of my proposed amendment.

Mr. President, before I was interrupted to permit the taking up of some other matters, I was in the midst of continuing a brief recital contained in a memorandum issued by the Department of Labor, the Children's Bureau, last year. I started to read the discussion of the types of boys, and this is particularly apropos in view of the statement of the Senator from South Carolina that these boys were made up of a large percentage of loafers, boys unwilling to work. I read from the pamphlet:

There is much testimony to the effect that these boys come from substantial American families. A study of 5,438 transient men and boys served by the Salvation Army in Atlanta during four winter months showed that 194 had been in college and 1,641 had attended high school. The Salvation Army in Washington, D. C., registered 7,512 transients during the first quarter of this year. Among them were 258 who were college trained, 2,060 who had been in high school, and 1,866 who had an eighth-grade education.

Social workers, police, and railroad men, who are in constant touch with these boys, assert their belief that the overwhelming majority of them are young men and boys who would normally be in school or at work, but that they are on the road because there is nothing else to do, sometimes because sheer pride will not permit them to sit idly at home, sometimes because the whole support of the family came from relief agencies, wholly inadequate properly to feed the younger children; that they are on the whole not the habitual hobo criminal type.

I think that effectually refutes the charges that these young boys are a lot of hoboes and unwilling to work.

Now, I want to draw the attention of the Senate to some of the hazards and hardships with which these boys have to

contend. The point I make is that these things are unnecessary. There is no necessity for these boys having to stand the hardships and take the hazardous risks that they do when the Federal Government has facilities to prevent it. I have no sympathy with keeping boys and men in idleness. I have no sympathy with laziness. I have no sympathy with indolence. But I refuse to be diverted from this plan simply because some Senators say that these boys do not want to work or that it is approaching the project from the wrong direction.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think we ought to have a quorum to hear the Senator from Michigan. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for that purpose?

Mr. COUZENS. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|----------|-------------|----------------|
| Austin | Couzens | Kendrick | Robinson, Ark. |
| Bailey | Cutting | Keyes | Robinson, Ind. |
| Bankhead | Davis | King | Russell |
| Barkley | Fess | La Follette | Schall |
| Bingham | Fletcher | Lewis | Schuyler |
| Black | Frazier | McKellar | Sheppard |
| Blaine | George | McNary | Shortridge |
| Borah | Gore | Moses | Smith |
| Bratton | Grammer | Neely | Smoot |
| Brookhart | Hale | Norbeck | Stelwer |
| Bulow | Harrison | Norris | Tydings |
| Byrnes | Hastings | Nye | Vandenberg |
| Capper | Hatfield | Oddie | Wagner |
| Caraway | Hebert | Pittman | Walsh, Mass. |
| Connally | Johnson | Reed | White |
| Coolidge | Kean | Reynolds | |

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

(At this point Mr. NORBECK submitted a motion relative to H. J. Res. 533, which appears on page 3855.)

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, before the quorum call I was about to discuss some of the hazards and hardships with which these young men have to contend. I hardly think it is necessary to emphasize the fact that the value of the youth to the country is recognized by all, and I do not think I shall take the time of the Senate to read from numerous documents I have here concerning the value of the youth of the country, notwithstanding the disparagement placed upon them by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I do wish, however, to quote from a memorandum prepared by the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor, as follows:

Boys accustomed to decent standards of living find themselves going for days at a time without taking off their clothes to sleep at night, becoming dirty, unkempt, a host of vermin. They may go for days with nothing to eat but coffee, bread, and beans. In winter they suffer from exposure. Last winter in one western city 35 young men and boys were removed from box cars seriously ill, some in advanced stages of pneumonia.

Yet, Mr. President, for the maintenance of the aristocracy of the Army these boys must not annoy them.

Continuing to quote:

Freight yards are policed. Hence trains must be boarded outside the yard limits while the train is in motion. One railroad alone reported more than 50 young men and boys killed and more than 100 crippled in this way last winter. It is no longer possible to pick up odd jobs here and there.

And yet, Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Arkansas say that we are not reaching the ills of the situation. Why this constant opposition to doing something that will relieve distress while we are attempting to find a mythical way of expanding currency and doing other things to get at the fundamentals? Every time some one approaches a problem of this kind the protestants get up and talk about not attacking "fundamentals." Well, Mr. President, I have heard the words "fundamentals" and "sound policies" and "economy," and so on, until I am sick and tired, and the whole United States

ought to be sick and tired of the constant repetition of the words "fundamentals," "economy," "sound money," and all that sort of crazy talk while millions and millions of our people are in distress.

We must not, Mr. President, do anything that will disturb "rugged individualism"! We must not do anything that in any manner, shape, or form will affect the dignity of the youth of the land. We must enable them to retain their self-respect; we must not offer them something for nothing; we must stand here and see them traveling in the slough of despond, in misery, in distress, and sickness, afflicted with venereal and other diseases, and at the same time stand by and preach "fundamentals" and "economy," and we must do this in spite of the fact that on one railroad alone 50 young men were killed and 100 crippled while traveling across the country in search of jobs, which the Senator from South Carolina says they should have, instead of receiving some assistance from their Government. Thousands more are being killed and crippled while the Senator from South Carolina says we are not dealing with "fundamentals." We must hold up measures of this kind and see these youths demoralized, while the Senator from South Carolina deals with "fundamentals," while he talks hazily about some method for providing new currency and some kind of credit expansion. We must first get all those questions settled while in the meantime the youths of the Nation are going through an experience to which no human being should be subjected.

Continuing to read from the memorandum of the Department of Labor:

It is no longer possible to pick up odd jobs here and there. Communities jealously reserve even the occasional short-time job for local residents. Therefore the unwelcome nonresident boys—

I emphasize the word "unwelcome." Can Senators who have sons and grandsons sit here and realize with complacency that there are 300,000 boys traveling over this country who are "unwelcome"? The nonresident boy is told everywhere he goes "Move on; move on; we will give you some coffee and beans to-night and a shack to live in, but to-morrow move on, move on." And yet we stand here and appropriate millions of dollars to maintain credit. To none of the measures making such appropriations have I expressed any opposition, and all I ask is that the same consideration and cooperation be given to these homeless boys by the beneficiaries under previous acts of Congress.

Therefore the unwelcome nonresident boy must either depend on the bread line or soup kitchen, or he must beg or steal. In the box cars, in the "jungles," as the camping sites adjacent to the railroad yards are called, or even in the municipal shelters, he will meet men whose entire influence is destructive—criminals, fugitives from justice planning new "jobs"—

Referring to criminal "jobs"—

and looking for clever new recruits—degenerates and perverts eager to initiate new boys into evil habits and teach them how they can pick up a few odd dollars in any big city. Such men are in the great minority, but one or two can do an incalculable amount of damage. Worst of all, perhaps, because it is so contagious, is the workless philosophy, the "getting by" attitude everywhere encountered and very easily acquired on the open road. To this species of demoralization the "keep them moving" policy universally in vogue not only offers no opposition but in fact contributes.

Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from South Carolina say we must not have the sacred Army of the United States demoralized by requesting them to take care of 88,000 destitute, vigorous, energetic boys who are unable to get work. What method of reasoning do these gentlemen employ? What is the philosophy of those who take this position?

Mr. President, not one-tenth of the energy has been devoted by Congress to the care of the human side as has been devoted to taking care of the financial side. Call that demagoguery, if you desire; but if it be demagoguery, I am willing to accept the challenge.

I recognize the desirability and the advantages of keeping commerce as free as possible through the maintenance of the ordinary channels of business; I recognize that we must do everything that is proper to permit depositors in banks

to withdraw their money so as to enable them to pay their help, to pay their bills, and to live. I am and have been willing to do that up to date, but I am now in doubt how much further we can go. I have been willing that the taxpayers' credit should be used to maintain the railroads' inordinate capitalization, because there are some 60,000,000 life policyholders in the United States whose equity in their policies I was unwilling to destroy. I have stood by and seen hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated for the aid and maintenance of the farmers, and have cheerfully contributed to support such measures, but now, Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Arkansas and some others from the South—a section which has been the greatest beneficiary under the appropriations of Congress to ameliorate flood and drought conditions, and to provide seed for farmers—stand up here and say that was perfectly all right because we got back 87 per cent in gold. Mr. President, I submit that what we will get back if we shall adequately take care of these youths will be worth more than 87 per cent in gold.

During the nearly 11 years that I have been a Member of the Senate I have seen almost every kind of legislation go through in the interest of business. I have not opposed those measures; I am not against the railroads or other business; I want to see their integrity maintained; but, Mr. President, I also want to see maintained the integrity of the youth of the land and I want to see them preserved. I am unable to understand men with sons and with grandchildren standing here and saying, "This scheme is impracticable because it will disturb the Army." What is there sacred about the Army or the Navy that they can not contribute their assistance to relieve a condition which everyone admits is intolerable and should not be permitted to continue?

The Senator from Pennsylvania was kind enough to have his clerk submit to me a memorandum of the reasons for the adverse report made on this bill by the Committee on Military Affairs. The first is—

While the Army has neither barracks nor tentage which could house as many as 100,000 men, Senator COUZENS estimates the number of applicants at about 300,000. Many members of the committee felt that the number would be far greater than this.

I do not criticize the committee for making that statement, for there was admittedly nothing in the bill which limited the number, but I had no information as to the capacity of the Army facilities. I did expect, however, that the Committee on Military Affairs would be sympathetic enough with the principle involved to go into the matter and rewrite the bill or insert amendments which would have shown some interest on their part and have taken care of the number of youths who could have been taken care of by the War Department without extending its facilities beyond their existing capacity.

Their second reason is:

The Army has no supply of clothing which could be issued to these young men.

The War Department in their letter to the Senator from Pennsylvania did not make any such statement as that. They said that whatever equipment or clothing was used for this purpose would have to be replenished. Of course I understand that and I understand appropriations will have to be made for replenishing the clothing which the Army will have to use in order to clothe these young boys.

3. The Army appropriation for subsistence is barely sufficient to feed the present Regular Army of 118,750 enlisted men. To feed 300,000 additional men would require a further appropriation of two and a half times as much as our present appropriation for this purpose.

I expected that the Military Affairs Committee, to which this bill was referred and which later referred it to a subcommittee, would amend the bill introduced to take care of the situation. But they never changed a word in the bill, Mr. President. They made no recommendations. The chairman of the subcommittee was the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], with whom I spoke about holding hearings. They not only did not hold any hearings, they not only did not ask me to come before the committee and

discuss the matter with them, but they just cold-bloodedly referred the matter to the Committee on Military Affairs without a hearing, without any consideration from persons who had familiarity with the subject, and referred it to the full Committee on Military Affairs, who, in turn, cold-bloodedly kicked it out on the calendar with an adverse report.

4. Discipline of this group of young men would be next to impossible, since they would not be enlisted and would be beyond the Army's authority to punish for infractions of rules. They could not even be required to keep their own quarters clean, and the Army has no funds with which it could employ civilian labor for this purpose.

Mr. President, I submit that with the intelligence of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, with his familiarity with War Department affairs, with the attention of the whole committee devoted to military affairs, the committee could have amended the bill so that these boys would have been required to keep their own quarters clean. They could have inserted in the bill a provision giving absolute authority to the commanders to discipline or dismiss boys who were taken in under their jurisdiction; but not one word did they change, Mr. President. Not one thing did they do. In other words, the whole proposal was received in a most unsympathetic manner and referred back with an adverse report.

Mr. President, days and days, weeks, and months have been given at this session of Congress by the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and other committees to devising ways and means to protect the credit structure of the country, to protect the railroads, to protect industry. Hours have been devoted to amending bills that were submitted. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] has spent hours of his brilliant, intellectual mind on laws to devise ways and means for taking people out of bankruptcy; but, Mr. President, the Military Affairs Committee never spent one minute to take out of moral bankruptcy these boys who are in it.

Why this great distinction between taking care of human beings and taking care of dollars? Why are dollars so much more precious than 100,000 boys tramping the country, looking for jobs? Why is that more important?

Oh, Mr. President, this is "demagoguery." This, perhaps, is what Sergeant at Arms Barry meant when he said there was demagoguery in the Senate. That is what is always alleged when anyone gets up here to defend the underprivileged boys, girls, and men of this country. To fight for them, to do anything to save them from the ills of the economic depression, is demagoguery. To get up here and plead for billions to maintain the credit structure, and the income from bonds, is statesmanship.

Mr. President, I have no desire to be called a statesman. I am glad to be called a demagogue if standing up here for hours in defense of these 300,000 boys is demagoguery.

The fifth objection submitted is as follows:

The presence of a body of unenlisted boarders of indefinite number at each military post would greatly impede the performance of the regular duties of the Army.

Mr. President, that is the weakest of them all! There was some foundation for the other excuses offered by the committee, but that is the weakest of all. "Unenlisted boarders"! One hundred thousand or 88,000 of the best of the youth of the Nation designated as "unenlisted boarders." "Unenlisted boarders"! Taken in because of economic conditions which they played no part in bringing about, they are called "unenlisted boarders"; and they, forsooth, Mr. President, would "greatly impede the performance of the regular duties of the Army"!

Pray, Mr. President, what are those "regular duties" which are so much more important than looking after 88,000 of the best flower of the country?

Oh, it is true that they are not the sons of any Members of this body. They do not belong to any fathers here, nor do they belong to the fathers who are Members of the House of Representatives. They belong to other fathers, who are just as fond of them as we in this body are fond of our children; and they are only "unenlisted boarders"!

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, my able colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS], has referred to the possibility that he may have earned classification as a demagogue because of his implacable insistence upon this humane legislation. He spoke sarcastically. But I want to address a preliminary word to this suggestion submitted by my colleague.

I presume he would be the last man who would sanction the thing I am now about to say. Nevertheless, I intend to say it, Mr. President. I intend to say that the interest which he displays in underprivileged boys is no new conception responding to the fleeting fancy of a vagrant moment. On the contrary, we of Michigan have grateful reason to know that not only his efforts and his sympathies, but his resources, with an amazing and almost unparalleled generosity, have been dedicated to underprivileged children for many fruitful years. Therefore, in the attitude which he takes to-day in this Chamber he is but pursuing the noble dedications of a lifetime; and the proposition that he lays upon the bar of the Senate this afternoon is but the lengthened shadow of a practical philosophy to which he has subscribed his own effort and resource for many blessed years. Uncounted children of Michigan are the beneficiaries of his sympathies in these respects. He is a veteran of many wars in their behalf.

No, Mr. President; there is no demagoguery in the attitude of my colleague upon this proposition. There is simply consistency in dedication to underprivileged children and to their fair chance in life.

Mr. President, I support the plea which my colleague has so eloquently and so earnestly submitted. I support the plea for many different reasons. May I say that among other reasons is the fact that I am a firm believer in the theory and philosophy of citizens' military training camps and reserve officers' training camps, and the inevitable advantage in terms of citizenship that comes from any contact with well-directed and intelligent military supervision.

It is true that under the terms of the pending amendment it is not proposed to induct these boys into active military commitments. Nevertheless, it is equally true, under the literal language of the amendment, that any of these boys admitted to these posts under these circumstances shall, so far as practicable—and I read from the amendment—"be subject to the customary discipline maintained at such posts, and shall participate in all forms of beneficial and healthful exercise." Furthermore, the Secretary of War is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Very well. Even though there be no enlistment, even though there be no military commitment, Mr. President, it seems to me that if these otherwise itinerant boys are gathered together under these military auspices, and if the direction of the adventure proceeds with any imagination at all, the net result must be to produce better citizens, and to produce them in very much the same sort of a patriotic reaction for which we appropriate many millions of dollars to create citizens' military training camps.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. REED. Let us take a practical case for illustration. Suppose that at Fort Myer we had a thousand or 2,000 of these young men, half white, half colored—doubtless they would be that—on a day like to-day. Just what would the Senator's own imagination provide for them to do? Military training is out of the question. That is not contemplated.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Why is it out of the question?

Mr. REED. The Senator from Michigan has stated that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Michigan has stated that there is no commitment, no enlistment; but he has not stated, nor do I believe that he contemplates, that there is to be a complete divorcement from the many activities that enter into the creation of sound bodies and sound minds under military auspices in these training camps.

Mr. REED. I understand that gymnasium work would be permitted, if there is a gymnasium, but that military training, drill, instruction in military subjects, is not contemplated. That is what I gathered as a result of the argument this morning. If military training is expected, certainly that ought to be stated; but if military training is not resorted to, just what type of healthful and beneficial exercise does the imagination of the Senator suggest for a day like to-day?

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, what would the Regular Army do?

Mr. REED. The Regular Army goes through with its drills. It has a lot of work to do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if I were in charge of the experiment involving these thousand young men at Fort Myer to whom the Senator refers, I would contemplate, on a day like this, a type of drill which would in no sense necessarily be a commitment to the regulations, and yet which could well involve the discipline and the character-building which is contemplated within the latitude of this amendment.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to his colleague?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do.

Mr. COUZENS. I am unable to know what the Senator from Pennsylvania refers to, because I see nothing in the amendment which prohibits military training.

Mr. REED. I understood the Senator this morning to say that military training was not contemplated, and the bill says nothing about it.

Mr. COUZENS. I say I did not contemplate it, because I am not a military man; but the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee is a military man. Why did not he put that in when the bill was before him, if he thought that was a good thing?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this colloquy between the senior Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Pennsylvania illustrates the point I am trying to make. There is no prohibition whatever in this bill against the use of the military brains with which the Army is commanded to create a ritual which will be of service not only to these temporary wards of the Government but to the Government itself in the reactions which, as I see the situation, can be built.

I am not a military man myself. I would not undertake to say what the specific possibilities are.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. In just a moment. I would undertake to say, however, that if the Senator from Pennsylvania with his military experience were in charge of those thousand boys at Fort Myer, or if the Senator from Maryland, who now rises to his feet and who also is a splendid soldier, were in charge of those thousand boys at Fort Myer, they would have a busy, useful, healthful day.

I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but I think we ought to have a larger attendance here while arguments for and against this proposition are being made. Would the Senator object to yielding for the purpose of a quorum call?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Inasmuch as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] has entered a motion to reconsider, which may be counted as business, the call for a quorum is in order, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|----------|----------|-------------|
| Austin | Caraway | Grammer | Keyes |
| Bailey | Connally | Hale | Kling |
| Bankhead | Coolidge | Harrison | La Follette |
| Bingham | Couzens | Hastings | Lewis |
| Black | Dale | Hayden | McKellar |
| Blaine | Fess | Hebert | McNary |
| Borah | Fletcher | Hull | Moses |
| Brookhart | Frazier | Johnson | Neely |
| Bulow | George | Kean | Norris |
| Capper | Gore | Kendrick | Nye |

| | | | |
|----------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Reed | Schall | Smith | Wagner |
| Reynolds | Schuyler | Smoot | Walsh, Mass. |
| Robinson, Ark. | Sheppard | Tydings | Walsh, Mont. |
| Russell | Shortridge | Vandenberg | |

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-five Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to propose a unanimous-consent agreement, that beginning on Monday at 12 o'clock no Senator shall speak longer than 15 minutes or more than once on the pending bill or amendments that are pending thereto and which may be offered to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair state in connection with that that there is already a unanimous-consent agreement to take a recess whenever the day's work may be finished?

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, would not the Senator from Oregon broaden the request so as to provide that no Senator should speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on any motion connected with the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Yes; I suppose that is contemplated. I certainly would include it. It is quite proper.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent that, beginning at 12 o'clock on Monday, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes in connection with the pending bill, or any amendment thereto, or any motion in connection therewith. Is there objection?

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand that if this is agreed to, we will go no farther to-night.

Mr. McNARY. That is the understanding.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I have an amendment I wish to offer, and I want to talk on the bill. While I could divide my remarks up, I would not like to be limited to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator would have 15 minutes on the bill, 15 minutes on any amendment he desired to offer, and 15 minutes on any motion in connection with the bill. Therefore, the Senator might have 45 minutes, if he chose to demand his rights.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

THE GRAIN FUTURES ACT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, although the price of wheat in the United States is to-day and for some time past has been ridiculously low, it is and has been substantially above an export parity. It is by far the highest priced wheat of any exporting nation in the world. Moreover, the speculative element of the grain trade apparently feel that the price of wheat is entirely too high; that to "help" the distressed farmer the below-the-cost-of-production price he is now receiving should be driven to still lower levels. In support of that statement I will quote from an editorial appearing in the Grain and Live Stock Herald (successor to the LaSalle Street Herald) of December 22, 1932, a financial and commercial journal published in Chicago. I quote:

The Grain Futures Administration, in its annual report to the Secretary of Agriculture, confirms the belief that we have long held, namely, that it was fear of Government interference with the trade and of drawing down the wrath of the bureaucrats on their heads that kept the short-sellers from driving and driving hard toward an export basis during the past four years at a time when they might have had some chance of success.

It was our belief, and has been, that one prime reason why we have not gotten on an export basis and did not fight to that level when prices were at a decent level was because the big speculators were afraid to act. They were afraid that if they sold heavily in Chicago against purchases in Winnipeg the Grain Futures Administration would see the report of their heavy volume of sales, call them on the carpet, and either force them to close their contracts or would force the exchange to close. This is borne out in large part by the fact that the instant the Secretary of Agriculture withdrew the requirement that trades of 500,000 bushels or more must be reported, the market here at Chicago immediately broke sharply * * *.

Mr. President, the statement that the large professional speculators, the self-styled "friends of the farmer," have been overwhelmingly on the short side of the wheat market during the past two crop years—July 1, 1930, to June 30, 1932, is amply supported by the records of the Grain Futures Administration. These official records disclose that during these two years the large speculators in the Chicago wheat market were net short on 521 days out of 598—87 per cent of the time—or nearly 9 days out of every 10. Moreover, the records further show that the largest net long position ever attained by the large speculators during the very brief time that they were net long was but 3,660,000 bushels contrasted with their maximum net short position of 13,700,000 bushels. It is a well-recognized fact that after these large speculators have entered the market on the short side their sole interest is in seeing prices decline to lower levels.

I can not subscribe to the doctrine of the "philanthropic speculators" who hope to "aid" the farmer by operating on the short side of the wheat market, and thus drive down the price of his product to still lower levels. On the other hand, I am convinced of the need of additional legislation to strengthen and reinforce the present grain futures act along the lines of the bill which I introduced at the beginning of the present Congress (S. 96).

Doctor Duvel, Chief of the Grain Futures Administration, has recently issued a statement explaining briefly just what the grain futures act is and what it is not, and I ask unanimous consent to incorporate his statement in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

THE GRAIN FUTURES ACT—WHAT IS IT?

(Statement by Dr. J. W. T. Duvel, Chief of Grain Futures Administration, United States Department of Agriculture)

In view of what appears to be a deliberate and rather well-planned campaign to create a false impression among farmers and others concerning the purpose and effect of the grain futures act and to confuse it with the tariff act of 1922, the agricultural marketing act of 1929, and the revenue act of 1932, it seems desirable at this time to restate in simple terms what the grain futures act is, how it came to be enacted, and what it does and does not do.

The grain futures act was passed in 1922. It was the result of 40 years of legislative effort to obtain some measure of control over the type of business known as dealings in grain futures on boards of trade. Constantly recurring corners and market manipulations had made Federal regulation necessary.

It was recognized that the boards of trade themselves had the power to prevent manipulation and to prevent the spreading of false rumors by members to influence prices. The problem was to force them to exercise their power and control over such matters against the selfish desires of the powerful speculative interests who by well-distributed patronage were able to dominate board-of-trade affairs. It is only fair to say that the majority of board-of-trade members were more or less disgusted with the conditions that existed, but fear of reprisals and ruin of their own business rendered them helpless to do anything.

The grain futures act is not to be regarded as farm-relief legislation, although it was passed in response to a widespread demand among farmers for market supervision. It does not fix prices or affect prices, except by freeing them from manipulative control. It aims merely to safeguard the price-making machinery. It does not prohibit short selling. It imposes no taxes of any kind. It places no limitation upon the amount of grain that may be bought or sold for future delivery by any person or interest. There is no limit upon the amount that a person may be either long or short, although amendments have been proposed from time to time to authorize such limitations.

Contrary to representations which have been made recently by those who know better, the Grain Futures Administration has never required any person, either speculator or grain dealer, to sell out any part of his holdings. The act contains no authority for such action. The Chicago Board of Trade, through its business conduct committee, some years ago established the principle that individual speculative lines in excess of 5,000,000 bushels were a dangerous market hazard. The Grain Futures Administration, while believing that a 5,000,000-bushel limit is too large for the safety of a stable market, has cooperated with the business conduct committee to the extent of informing the committee of situations where single accounts approached or were above 5,000,000 bushels. The business conduct committee has warned individual speculators against increasing dangerous speculative lines, but has not, to the knowledge of the Grain Futures Administration, ever ordered them to close their trades or even to reduce their lines.

So much for the "restrictions" which the big speculator so vigorously opposes. In this connection, it is interesting to note that his opposition is heard always in the plea that except for the

supervision imposed by the grain futures act which he chooses to call "restrictions," he would be in the market as a buyer supporting prices to help the farmer. During the past two and one-half years, however, when the Government itself for a time was undertaking to support prices for the benefit of farmers, the large speculators in Chicago wheat futures—those having accounts long or short at any one time in excess of 500,000 bushels in one future—were in the market practically all of the time, but, as a group, were pursuing the selling side. The group as a whole was net short most of this period. To be exact, from April 1, 1930, to June 30, 1932, out of a total of 675 trading days the group was short on 593 days, long on 81 days, and even 1 day.

The load of this short selling, as well as the hedging load occasioned by the large stocks of wheat in store during this period, was carried by the thousands of small speculators throughout the country, aided by the support given the futures market for a time by the Government through the Grain Stabilization Corporation. The small speculators, composing the so-called general trading public and the hedgers, are the ones who make maintenance of the futures market possible. Without them there would be no futures market.

The grain futures act since its inception has been strenuously opposed by the speculative element on the exchanges. At the outset it was carried to the United States Supreme Court in an attack upon its constitutionality. In spite of the fact that it was fully sustained in a sweeping decision announced by Chief Justice Taft, it is still being contested in the courts from every possible new angle of attack. At this moment a case is pending in the circuit court of appeals for the seventh circuit to enjoin the Secretary of Agriculture from exercising his power to require reports and to inspect the records of board of trade members.

What is there in the grain futures act so objectionable to the grain exchanges and the large speculators in the futures market?

Briefly stated, the principal provisions of the grain futures act are as follows:

1. Any board of trade desiring to maintain a market for dealing in grain for future delivery must be designated a "contract market" by the Secretary of Agriculture.

2. In order to be designated a contract market, a board of trade must meet the following requirements: (a) It must undertake to prevent manipulation of prices and the cornering of grain by members. (b) It must prevent its members from disseminating false and misleading crop and market information to influence prices. (c) It must not discriminate against cooperative associations in the matter of membership rights and trading privileges. (d) It must make certain reports to the Secretary of Agriculture and must require members to keep certain records open to inspection by properly authorized agents of the Government.

Has the Government been unreasonable or exercised unnecessary power by way of requiring reports or in the matter of inspecting books and records of board of trade members? In the suit brought to enjoin the Secretary from exercising his powers in this respect, which suit is pending on appeal to the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, Judge Wilkerson of the United States district court at Chicago on February 12, 1932, expressed the opinion of the court as follows:

"The court finds that the Secretary has not transcended the limits of what is essential to the intelligent performance of the broad duties imposed upon him by the statute. To limit his right to inspect books to cases in which he has already obtained information justifying a formal complaint against somebody defeats the purpose of the act. Regulation of boards of trade as contract markets necessarily requires, as the basis for the exercise of the regulatory authority, information concerning the business, in the transaction of which the board is used as an instrument."

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 26, 1933.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on Muscle Shoals written by the Hon. Josephus Daniels.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTRUCTIVE CONSERVATION—A BACKWARD GLANCE

The suggested development of the Tennessee Basin by President-elect Roosevelt is the most constructive and far-reaching conservation project in our history. It recalls the early conservation fight made by Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot against the dissipation of our natural resources. The difference is this: Franklin Roosevelt's plan for the development of Muscle Shoals and the Tennessee Basin is proposed as a means of decentralization of industry and greater reforestation. Frank P. Walsh, chairman of the Power Authority of the State of New York, a high authority on power and kindred questions, says that President-elect Roosevelt's Muscle Shoals project will have "even more profound results throughout the Nation than did the building of the Panama Canal." Mr. Walsh adds that Mr. Roosevelt "has worked out a plan under which the project when completed will be self-sustaining. We now have high assurance that one of the greatest natural resources of our country will be fully developed, to endure for all time as a monument to those who have had the vision and the courage to preserve it and statesmanship to devote it to the service of the American people."

President-elect Roosevelt's plan of development recalls an editorial on conservation which appeared in the News and Observer

in its issue of February 10, 1910. It is furnished to this paper by J. S. Holmes, State forester, who writes that "in going over some old papers which I brought from Chapel Hill eight years ago" he found the copy of the paper which, he says, "emphasizes the fact to which I have often referred of your continued and unswerving support of conservation." He adds: "I can not help seeing a close connection between your attitude and the forward-looking policy which has so frequently been initiated by the President elect since you and he worked together for the protection of the oil supply of the United States."

The editorial in the News and Observer of February 10, 1910, is applicable this February, for present conditions emphasize the need of conservation at this time. It is as follows:

"CONSERVATION NEEDED SOUTH"

"Aside from the direct issue of graft and public rights handed out for private exploitation raised by Gifford Pinchot in his manly fight for the Alaskan coal fields, in which the Ballinger handling of affairs has been vigorously attacked, there is even a more important reflex effect upon the entire country, which has been given a sharp notice to be on guard to protect other of its natural resources.

"In this problem of the conservation of natural resources the South has perhaps more at stake than has any other section of the country, and in the opening of the eyes of the Nation to its immense economic needs the South will be benefited if it will be taught the lessons that are plainly brought out in the sensational developments of the Pinchot-Ballinger controversy. The vast coal fields of Alaska are of great importance, and these ought not to be permitted to be gobbled up by private corporations working for greed, to the injury of the entire people, the few to reap at the expense of the many. In a still greater degree the South must look to the conservation of its water powers and of its forests.

"There are by a rough estimate some 200,000,000 acres of forest lands in the South, and these acres form about two-fifths of the entire timber acreage of the United States. In these forests of the South there are to be found the most valuable species of trees, all the longleaf pine, and all the cypress, in these broad acres being the source of naval stores and a great part of the supply of the hardwoods that are so valuable. These forests are not alone of immense value as to the money worth of the gift of nature in them, but there is an enormous added value in their relation to soil betterment and to water supply, agriculture and health, both being great debtors to the trees of this section.

"A matter that presses for quick attention is the conservation of these natural timber resources, for the indiscriminate inroads into the forests of the South means that in from 15 to 25 years cutting, at the present rate, the timber area will be desolate, a fact which is so patent that intelligent care for the forest area is a matter which presses upon the South in a far greater manner than the Alaskan coal fields upon the Nation.

"Fourteen thousand sawmills in the South are busily at work making inroads into the forests, these being about 45 per cent of all the sawmills in the United States, and with the evident fact that as the timber decreases the more vigorous will be the assaults upon the forests to secure what is left, the prospect is not an encouraging one. In this exploitation of southern forest area there is much capital from the North and East at work, these foreign interests caring nothing for the future, being only concerned in the profit taking of to-day.

"That the South should conserve its foreign interests is a matter of great importance and this can be done without placing any obstacles in the way of legitimate business enterprises. It is recognized that the lumber industry of the South is among its most important assets and there should be no legislation that would harass it. Yet despite everything that can be said there should be regulation of some kind that would tend to perpetuate our forests, to so arrange that as these are cut away new forests would arise, and that the vast areas be made to again provide for the call for timber.

"The South has need of the conservation spirit in not allowing its vast timber wealth to be treasure of to-day only, and it should take steps to regulate matters to the end that its forests be protected, each of the Southern States to have forestry commissions that would give intelligent study to conditions as they exist and plan on large scale to see that these vast natural resources are not foolishly wasted, but are cared for and nourished so that we may not rob the future for the mere gain of the present, that we conserve these great interests in a manner that will be of lasting value, giving to the generations yet to come that which is their due."

**MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION
SIGNED**

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 597) to provide appropriations to carry into effect the act entitled "An act to authorize the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress," approved February 8, 1933, and it was signed by the Vice President.

RECESS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I move that the Senate carry out the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into, and take a recess until 12 o'clock Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock p. m.), under the order previously entered, took a recess until Monday, February 13, 1933, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1933

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, strong to save, incline Thine heart and hear our prayer. Allow no unworthy thought or desire to come with us into the presence of the Most High. Thou hast said the servant is not above his master, or the disciple above his Lord. Let the light of the first century be the light for the twentieth century. We beseech Thee to let Thy word be most thought compelling, most zeal inspiring, and country-wide transforming. We pray that it may bear the world onward to the goal of God's benevolent purposes. The Lord give us the power of might to respond with sweeping conviction to the appeals of our neighbors, our comrades, our fellow citizens, and even the stranger within our gates. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9166. An act for the relief of William E. B. Grant.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4368. An act for the relief of the widow of George W. McDonald;

H. R. 7518. An act to amend an act entitled "An act extending certain privileges of canal employees to other officials on the Canal Zone and authorizing the President to make rules and regulations affecting health, sanitation, quarantine, taxation, public roads, self-propelled vehicles, and police powers on the Canal Zone, and for other purposes, including provision as to certain fees, money orders, and interest deposits," approved August 21, 1916;

H. R. 7519. An act to amend the Penal Code of the Canal Zone;

H. R. 7520. An act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure for the Canal Zone;

H. R. 7521. An act to provide a new Code of Civil Procedure for the Canal Zone and to repeal the existing Code of Civil Procedure;

H. R. 7522. An act to provide a new Civil Code for the Canal Zone and to repeal the existing Civil Code;

H. R. 7716. An act to amend the radio act of 1927, approved February 23, 1927, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 47, ch. 4), and for other purposes;

H. R. 9272. An act to correct the rating of John Huntz Roloff, Fleet Naval Reserve; and

H. R. 9473. An act for the relief of Olen H. Parker.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1730. An act for the relief of Robert J. Smith;

S. 2508. An act for the relief of Maj. O. S. McCleary, United States Army, retired;

S. 2582. An act for the relief of Leo James McCoy;

S. 2583. An act for the relief of Albert Lawrence Sliney;

S. 2862. An act for the relief of W. H. Hendrickson;

S. 4589. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment of part of the expenses incurred in securing improvements in drainage project of drainage district No. 1, Richardson County, Nebr., and for other purposes;

S. 4590. An act for the relief of Juan Apodaca;

S. 5052. An act to empower the health officer of the District of Columbia to authorize the opening of graves, and